QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

Speech Association of America

~~FEBRUARY~~ · 1961
Volume XLVII · ~~Number 1.~~

Q 1
v.47

The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

FOUNDED 1915

Volume XLVII—Number 1 February 1961

Published by Speech Association of America

EDITOR

Richard Murphy, 204A Lincoln Hall, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois

ADVISORY BOARD

Donald C. Bryant (Editor, 1957-1959), State University of Iowa
Wilbur Samuel Howell (Editor, 1954-1956), Princeton University
Bower Aly (Editor, 1951-1953), University of Oregon

EDITORIAL BOARD

Contributing Editors

NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW	Robert G. Gunderson, Indiana University
SHOP TALK	Robert L. Scott, University of Minnesota

Associate Editors

AMERICAN PUBLIC ADDRESS	Ernest J. Wrage, Northwestern University
BRITISH PUBLIC ADDRESS	Carroll C. Arnold, Cornell University
THE CLASSICAL TRADITION	Walter J. Ong, St. Louis University
DISCUSSION AND DEBATE	Gregg Phifer, Florida State University
DRAMA AND THEATRE	Francis R. Hodge, University of Texas
ETHICS OF SPEECH AND PROFESSIONAL ETHICS	Elbert W. Harrington, State University of South Dakota
EXPERIMENTAL AND QUANTITATIVE STUDIES	Theodore Clevenger, Jr., University of Wisconsin
HOMILETICS AND PREACHING	John W. Bachman, Union Theological Seminary
INTERPRETATION	Don Geiger, University of California
MASS COMMUNICATION AND OPINION	Ross Scanlan, College of the City of New York
PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURES	Alice Sturgis, Piedmont 11, California
PHONETICS, LINGUISTICS, BILINGUAL SPEECH	Elizabeth Carr, University of Hawaii
RADIO, TV, AND FILM	Edward Stasheff, University of Michigan
RHETORICAL THEORY AND CRITICISM	Marie Hochmuth, University of Illinois
SPEECH AND HEARING DISORDERS	James F. Curtis, State University of Iowa
TEACHING OF SPEECH	Magdalene Kramer, Teachers College, Columbia University
VOICE, DICTION, AND PRONUNCIATION	Virgil A. Anderson, Stanford University

The Quarterly Journal of Speech is published in the months of February, April, October, and December. Contributions prepared in accordance with The MLA Style Sheet may be sent to the Editor or to the appropriate Associate Editor. Subscriptions and requests for advertising rates should be addressed to Robert C. Jeffrey, Executive Secretary, Speech Association of America, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

Regular subscription price $5.50 per year. Special subscriptions for undergraduate students $3.50 per year. Single copy of current issue $1.50. A comprehensive Index of the issues of the year is bound in each December Journal. The Contents are also indexed in the Education Index. For volumes prior to 1929 consult Readers Guide to Periodical Literature. For complete, analytical coverage through 1954, see Index to the Quarterly Journal of Speech, Volumes I-XL, 1915-1954, compiled by Giles W. Gray (1956). Volumes I-III were published under the title The Quarterly Journal of Public Speaking; Volumes IV-XIII, The Quarterly Journal of Speech Education.

Entered as second-class matter at the post office at Columbia, Missouri, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Copyright 1961 by the Speech Association of America

7/12/62 Sm I

The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOLUME XLVII FEBRUARY 1961 NUMBER 1

LINCOLN AND THE POLICY OF ELOQUENT SILENCE: NOVEMBER, 1860, TO MARCH, 1861

Robert G. Gunderson

DURING the tense winter of 1860-1861, fear prompted the utterances of politicians and pervaded the thoughts of the people. Extremists on both sides of the Ohio were issuing calls-to-arms. Advocates of preventive war hopefully proclaimed that "one campaign . . . would settle the matter"; some even said "it might be finished by haying time."[1] Each day in the headlines of the *Tribune,* Horace Greeley reiterated the slogan, "NO NEGOTIATIONS WITH TRAITORS."[2] Ohio Congressman John A. Gurley assured Lincoln that the Buckeye State would furnish 100,000 troops, if necessary. "The time for compromise has passed," Gurley warned; "the only argument the extreme Southern men . . . feel is that of *steel* and *lead*."[3] Jeff Davis gave answer on his arrival at the provisional Confederate capital in Montgomery, Alabama. "We are now determined," said the newly-elected President of the Confederacy, "to . . . make all who oppose us smell Southern powder and feel Southern steel."[4] A dividing nation was completing its psychological preparation for war. Soon, many were to join the impetuous Greeley in exclaiming, "Let this suspense and uncertainty cease. . . . If we are to fight, so be it."[5]

In this crisis, many Republican politicians feared a split in their party even more than the disintegration of the Union. "Another danger," Salmon P. Chase wrote Lincoln, "is greater still and more imminent—and that is the disruption of the Republican Party through Congressional attempts at compromises."[6] Carl Schurz issued the same warning: to yield a single principle of the Chicago platform will result in "the immediate disruption of the party."[7] Henry Adams put it even more bluntly.

Mr. Gunderson is Professor of Speech and Theatre at Indiana University. He has been QJS editor of New Books since 1957. He is the author of The Log-Cabin Campaign. *Another book,* Old Gentlemen's Convention, *will be published this summer.*

---

[1] Elizur Wright to Charles Sumner, January 19, 1861, Charles Sumner MSS, Harvard University Library.

[2] New York *Semi-Weekly Tribune,* February 1861.

[3] John A. Gurley to Abraham Lincoln, [January 1861], Robert Todd Lincoln Collection, Library of Congress.

[4] Albany *Atlas & Argus,* February 19, 1861.

[5] New York *Semi-Weekly Tribune,* April 3, 1861.

[6] Salmon P. Chase to Abraham Lincoln, January 28, 1861, R. T. Lincoln Collection.

[7] Carl Schurz to Abraham Lincoln, December 18, 1861, *ibid.*

"The worst that is to be feared is . . . a division of the party," he announced. A "good deal depends for us on a little bit of a fight. . . . If Major Anderson and his whole command were all murdered in cold blood, it would be an excellent thing for the country. . . ."[8]

Less radical Republicans, notably Thurlow Weed, Edwin D. Morgan, Thomas Corwin, and William H. Seward counseled moderation. "Best that every thought that we think," Seward advised Lincoln, "be conciliatory [,] forbearing and fraternal. . . ."[9] A severe commercial recession stimulated a spirit of conciliation among businessmen. Greeley's correspondent in Washington noted that the desire for compromise was "almost overpowering, in commercial circles."[10] After reporting an unprecedented "mercantile gloom," New York stockbroker George D. Morgan concluded, "If the Republicans do not now retain the Border Slave States by conciliation, they will defeat the party and overwhelm the country in trouble and disaster."[11] Moses H. Grinnell, J. J. Astor, R. M. Blatchford, and an impressive list of prominent Republican capitalists appealed to Lincoln "to lay aside party trammels" and offer "fair terms of conciliation" to the Border States.[12] Conservative politicians and editors joined in urging Lincoln to issue some statement which might strengthen the hand of Southern Unionists and thereby save the Border States.[13]

To counteract such appeals, the radical New York editor, William Cullen Bryant, assured the President-Elect that "those Republicans who have no connection with Wall Street regard a compromise . . . [with] a feeling of decided aversion." "The people have given their verdict," Bryant said with finality, "and they do not expect . . . their representatives . . . to change or modify it in any degree."[14]

Faced with this irrepressible conflict within his own party, Lincoln continued the silence which had characterized his campaign.[15] "Maintain the grand effect of your eloquent silence," wrote William Hunt from Philadelphia, "and when the time comes for you to speak, let it be in the thunder of brevity."[16] His intimate advisor, Senator Lyman Trumbull of Illinois, agreed. "There is some difference of opinion among friends here as to whether you ought to say or write anything to allay the present excitement," Trumbull wrote from Washington. "Our most reliable friends . . . think not. . . . These commercial men by their alarm are greatly magnifying the difficulty."[17]

As the time approached for his trip to Washington, Lincoln again received contrary advice. Seward urged that he come "by surprise—without announcement."[18] Salmon P. Chase suggested a publicized journey, "accepting the popular demonstrations" en route. "This would be imposing," Chase thought, "and [would] have an effect."[19] Lincoln eventually endorsed this alternative, but when his itinerary was published, Chase became alarmed. "I see that your route . . . is announced through Buffalo & Albany," wrote the Ohio radical with obvious concern. "Will not this roundabout way involve too much fatigue & exhaustion? . . . I am glad that you have relinquished your idea of proceeding to Washington in a private way. It is important to allow full scope to the enthusiasm of the people just now. But a circuitous journey may not have so useful effects as one more direct, besides being more fatiguing to yourself."[20] Lincoln's fatigue, however, was of incidental concern when compared with the risk of exposing the President-Elect to the blandishments of the Republican boss of New York, Thurlow Weed, and his conservative business associates. "We trust," the hostile Albany *Atlas & Argus* editorialized, "that Mr. Lincoln's journey . . . will be marked by good taste and good sense, not only on his part, but also on the part of his friends and the public generally."[21]

---

[8] Henry Adams to Charles Francis Adams, Jr., January 8 and 17, 1861, in Worthington C. Ford, ed., *Letters of Henry Adams (1858-1891)* (Boston, 1930), pp. 77, 82.

[9] William H. Seward to Abraham Lincoln, January 27, 1861, R. T. Lincoln Collection.

[10] New York *Semi-Weekly Tribune,* February 12, 1861.

[11] George D. Morgan to Edwin D. Morgan, February 1, 1861, Edwin D. Morgan MSS, New York State Library.

[12] M. H. Grinnell to Abraham Lincoln, January 29, 1861, R. T. Lincoln Collection. Letter endorsed by a long list of Republican financiers.

[13] Henry J. Raymond, Schuyler Colfax, N. P. Banks, Montgomery Blair, and others to Abraham Lincoln, *ibid.*

[14] William Cullen Bryant to Abraham Lincoln, December 25, 1860, *ibid.*

[15] Democrats of Kalamazoo, Michigan, for example, had caricatured him with a padlock on his lips. New York *Semi-Weekly Tribune,* October 26, 1860.

[16] William Hunt to Abraham Lincoln, December 13, 1860, R. T. Lincoln Collection.

[17] Lyman Trumbull to Abraham Lincoln December 14 and 17, 1860, *ibid.*

[18] [William H. Seward] to Abraham Lincoln, December 29, 1860, *ibid.* MS in Seward's handwriting, labeled "Private."

Fortified with this gratuitous advice, Lincoln set out for Washington on the morning of February 11. A quarrel with Mrs. Lincoln over the appointment of a postmaster for Springfield caused a few hectic moments just before the departure; as a result the prospective first lady failed to join the Presidential party. A crowd of nearly a thousand gathered at the depot to say good-by in weather which some reporters described as pouring rain, and others as falling snowflakes. Lincoln mounted the platform of the rear car and delivered the brief farewell which is recognized as one of his most moving utterances. Though correspondents disagreed on the state of the weather and the whereabouts of Mrs. Lincoln, they clearly discerned a faint tear on Lincoln's cheek as he concluded.[22]

Members of a public gathering in Oberlin, Ohio, voted to assure Lincoln that his farewell remarks "moved our hearts deeply and strengthened the hopes of our country under your administration." Religious citizens commented especially upon his "earnest avowal of trust in God," for rumors of his unorthodox theological views were widespread.[23] The unsympathetic Cincinnati *Enquirer,* however, pointed out that he ignored the urgent questions which faced a divided nation. "The comparison he drew between himself and Washington was in most detestable taste. Washington and Lincoln!" exclaimed the *Enquirer.* "A hyperion and a satyr. Washington helped make the Government; Lincoln, we fear, has been the instrument of its destruction."[24]

These responses to his farewell speech reflected the contrasting hopes and fears of almost everyone, for Lincoln was relatively unknown when he left Springfield on February 11. Senator George E. Pugh of Ohio, for example, called him "the most obscure man that ever had been elected to the Presidency."[25] His opponents stereotyped him as coarse, illiterate, vulgar, and fanatical, as well as atheistic. Southern papers alleged that he possessed simian characteristics. Demonstrating a marked restraint for a Southern journal, the Houston *Telegraph* described him as "the leanest, lankiest, most ungainly mass of legs, arms and hatchet-face ever strung upon a single frame. He has most unwarrantably abused the privilege which all politicians have of being ugly and when he unfolds his everlasting legs and rises to speak, his unique countenance is expressive of the most complete inanity. . . ."[26] The unprecedented public display en route to Washington was no doubt an attempt to give Americans a somewhat more realistic view of their President-Elect. But since each audience demanded a speech, every railway junction provided a threat to Lincoln's policy of silence.

---

[19] Salmon P. Chase to N. B. Judd, January 20, 1861, *ibid.*

[20] Salmon P. Chase to Abraham Lincoln, January 28, 1861, *ibid.*

[21] Albany *Atlas & Argus,* February 12, 1861.

[22] *New York Times,* New York *Semi-Weekly Tribune,* Cincinnati *Gazette,* Cincinnati *Enquirer,* Detroit *Free Press,* February 12, 1861; John Cook to Lyman Trumbull, February 11, 1861, Lyman Trumbull MSS, Library of Congress; Paul M. Angle, ed., *The Lincoln Reader* (New Brunswick, N. J., 1947), pp. 308-309.

[23] John Keep and Henry Cowles to Abraham Lincoln, February 14, 1860, R. T. Lincoln Collection.

[24] Cincinnati *Enquirer,* February 12, 1861.

[25] *New York Times,* December 21, 1860.

A salute of thirty-four guns announced the approach of the Presidential special to Indianapolis. Five thousand people, including two brass bands, the Indianapolis National Guard, the local Zouaves, and Governor Oliver P. Morton, greeted Old Abe as he disembarked. After a highly partisan welcome by the radical Governor and a brief impromptu reply, Lincoln paraded to the Bates House. Amid the confusion, carriages reserved for the Presidential party were appropriated by local politicians; as a result Lincoln's bag containing a draft of his Inaugural address was temporarily lost.[27] His prepared speech, delivered from the balcony of the Bates House, aroused much tense speculation. Though he made no categorical statement of policy, he nevertheless asked some rather tantalizing riddles. "What then," mused the President-Elect, "is 'coercion'? What is 'invasion'? Would the marching of an army into South Carolina . . . be coercion or invasion? I very frankly say, I think it would. . . . But if the Government . . . simply insists upon holding its own forts, or retaking those forts which belong to it, —[cheers]—or the enforcement of the laws of the United States in the collection of duties upon foreign importations,—[renewed cheers]—or even the withdrawal of the mails from those portions of the country where the mails themselves are habitually violated; would any or all of these things be coercion?" After a series of questions of this sort, he concluded with a whimsical, "I say I am deciding nothing, but simply giving something for you to reflect upon. . . ."[28]

Radical Republicans complained that these riddles hardly constituted "the thunder of brevity." Moderates were dismayed by the implied threats, and Southern Unionists lost hope of success in their bitter battle with Secessionists. Radical Congressman Samuel Ryan Curtis of Iowa confided in his diary that Lincoln at Indianapolis "went a little into political matters contrary to his general policy and to my regret for I would prefer that his first speech should be his inaugural at the Eastern portico of the Capitol."[29] The Indianapolis *Sentinel* was disappointed by Lincoln's failure to "sympathize with the conservative element of his party." The Cleveland *Plain Dealer* published the speech under the heading, "LINCOLN HAS SPOKEN. HE GOES FOR TAKING THE SOUTHERN FORTS—WAR INEVITABLE!"[30] George

---

[26] Houston *Telegraph,* (n. d.), quoted in New York *Semi-Weekly Tribune,* June 19, 1860.

[27] *New York Times,* February 12, 1861; George S. Cottman, "Lincoln in Indianapolis," *Indiana Magazine of History,* XXIV (1928), 4-10.

[28] Roy P. Basler, ed., *The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln* (New Brunswick, N. J., 1953), IV, 195-96.

[29] Samuel Ryan Curtis MS Private Journal, Illinois State Historical Library.

[30] Indianapolis *Sentinel,* (n. d.), quoted in *Indiana Magazine of History,* XXIV, 9; Cleveland *Plain Dealer,* February 12, 1861.

D. Prentice, a Kentucky Unionist, mourned Lincoln's remarks as "a gross outrage not only upon good taste but the sacred proprieties of his position." The Lexington *Kentucky Statesman* joined Prentice in concluding that Lincoln sported with "fire-balls in a powder magazine."[31]

Lincoln celebrated his fifty-second birthday, February 12, by taking breakfast with Governor Morton. Mrs. Lincoln, apparently recovered from her pique, joined the party in time to set out for Cincinnati. A demonstrative Hoosier crowd delayed their departure, but the train eventually sped away at thirty miles an hour and within five hours the spires of Cincinnati came into view. The 160,000 inhabitants of America's eighth city had anticipated Lincoln's arrival. Newspapers of the several political persuasions had carefully instructed their readers in the etiquette of welcoming presidents-elect. The hostile *Enquirer* hoped that nothing would be done to wound Lincoln's feelings. The booming of cannon and a prolonged cheer greeted him as he stepped from his coach. So great was the crowd that the police were pushed aside, and, as one reporter said, "many a dainty feminine form bore the unmannerly crush without a murmur of remonstrance." The inevitable procession escorted Lincoln to the Burnet House where he reassured his friends from Kentucky that "we mean to treat you . . . as Washington, Jefferson, and Madison treated you. We mean to leave you alone, and in no way to interfere with your institution. . . ." Then, in a conclusion which impressed even the *Enquirer,* he affirmed his trust in "the good sense of the American people, on all sides of all rivers. . . ."[32]

Impressions in Cincinnati varied with the political view of the observer. The *Commercial* reported that "Old Abe's physique was freely discussed in the crowd . . . and many were evidently disappointed in not finding him so atrociously ugly as he had been represented." A correspondent of the *Enquirer* watched Lincoln's "dark countenance" and reflected upon comparisons "which Mrs. Malaprop pronounced as 'odorous.'" "He looks well and is in good spirits," the Louisville *Democrat* announced cheerfully, but *The New York Times* observer saw "a shocking bad hat and a very thin old overcoat." The sympathetic *Gazette* thought that "no man ever bore himself more modestly or with more noble self-possession."[33]

Conservative editors took encouragement from the milder tone of the Cincinnati speech as compared with the one in Indianapolis. "The further LINCOLN gets from the Illinois land speculators," observed the *Enquirer,* "the more liberal he becomes." Echoing this sentiment in the Louisville *Journal,* Prentice claimed that Old Abe "improves as he proceeds." "If the improvement be kept up, he may arrive at Washington a wise man." The hostile Louisville *Democrat* conceded that "he does not seem near so terrible a creature as the secessionists would have him."[34]

---

[31] Lexington *Kentucky Statesman,* February 19, 1861.

[32] Cincinnati *Enquirer,* February 9 and 13, 1861; Cincinnati *Gazette,* February 13, 1861; Cincinnati *Commercial,* February 12, 1861; Robert G. Gunderson, "Lincoln in Cincinnati," *Ohio Historical and Philosophical Society Bulletin,* VIII (1950), 258-66; Basler, ed., *Collected Works,* IV, 199.

[33] Cincinnati *Commercial,* Cincinnati *Enquirer,* Louisville *Democrat,* Cincinnati *Gazette,* February 13, 1861; *New York Times,* February 19, 1861.

[34] Cincinnati *Enquirer,* February 14, 1861; Louisville *Journal,* February 16, 1861; Louisville *Democrat,* February 13, 1861.

Having thus impressed the citizens along the Ohio, Lincoln arose early on the morning of February 13 and boarded a special train for Columbus. A delegation from the Ohio Legislature joined him for the journey, and at nine A.M. the train set out. He made brief appearances en route at Milford, Loveland, Morrow, and Corwin. At Xenia, citizens fired a cannon by way of greeting, and the train moved on toward Columbus, where for several days a chain gang from the Ohio Penitentiary had been busy raking up the mud from the streets in preparation for his visit. "So far," said a dispatch from Columbus, "the citizens . . . have cause to give thanks as the streets have been about ankle deep."[35]

In Columbus, Lincoln dined at the home of Governor William Dennison, addressed a joint session of the Ohio Legislature, and held a reception in the House of Representatives. In what one correspondent described as "a brief but humorous speech," Lincoln defended his non-committal policy: " . . . I have received from some a degree of credit for having kept silence, and from others some deprecation. I still think that I was right. . . . I have not maintained silence from any want of real anxiety. It is a good thing that there is no more than anxiety, for there is nothing wrong."[36] His awkwardly-phrased optimism was fortified by a telegram from Washington announcing the peaceful determination of the electoral vote by Congress.

The thirty-four gun salutes, balcony addresses, and handshaking receptions were repeated the next day in Pittsburgh, where throngs ignored rainy weather to see the President-Elect perched on the balcony of the Monongahela House. "If Mr. Lincoln is not worn out before he gets to the White House," said the Cleveland *Leader,* "it will not be for want of long rides by day and long receptions by night. Anything but a tough western constitution would speedily break down under the strain."[37] After a night in Pittsburgh, the Presidential party circled back once again into Ohio.

Over a thousand gathered to greet Lincoln's train in Alliance, irreverently dubbed "The City of Mud" by visiting reporters. When called on for a speech, Lincoln facetiously announced that he understood "there was a turkey for him to discuss" at the Sourbeck Hotel. With this witticism, he was hurried off to dinner. In their unrestrained enthusiasm, however, the local citizenry fired such a resounding cannonade of welcome that many hotel windows were shattered, including the one at which the Presidential party was seated. Surviving this hazard of Presidential travel, Lincoln delivered a few sentences of greeting. "If I should make a speech at every town," he opined, "I would not get to Washington until sometime after the inauguration." With this, Lincoln boarded his train and was off. "It is unfortunate, whined one local newsman, "that much of the time spent at Alliance was taken up by the dinner at Sourbeck's.[38]

At Hudson, nine carloads of admirers from towns throughout the Western Reserve waited patiently for the Presidential special which had been delayed by the cannon-blast at Alliance. On arrival, Lincoln favored them with one of his briefest efforts: "I stepped upon the platform to see you, and to give you an opportunity to see me, which I suppose you desire to do. You see by my voice that I am quite hoarse. You will not, therefore expect a speech from me." He then waved graciously; the train, appropriately named "The Comet," pulled away from the station with young Robert Lincoln, "The Prince of Rails," at the throttle.[39]

---

[35] Louisville *Democrat,* February 13, 1861; Cincinnati *Enquirer,* February 14, 1861.

[36] Basler, ed., *Collected Works,* IV, 204; *New York Times,* February 14, 1861.

[37] Cleveland *Leader,* February 15, 1861.

[38] *Ibid.,* February 16, 1861; *New York Times,* February 16, 1861; J. H. Cramer, "Lincoln in Ohio," *Ohio Archeological and Historical Quarterly,* LIV (1945), 163-65.

A downpour greeted Lincoln as he stepped from his car in Cleveland. A partisan decision by General Jabez W. Fitch, Democratic commander of the militia, prevented the local regiment from escorting the next Commander-in-Chief to his quarters at the Weddell House where twenty-nine rooms had been reserved for the Presidential entourage. In spite of this inconvenience, Lincoln somehow managed to negotiate his way through the crowds on Euclid Avenue, accompanied by a mounted escort, a full-rigged ship on wheels, a company of light artillery, the Cleveland Grays, and the Omnibus of the Forest City Tool Company.

At the Weddell House, Lincoln repeated the familiar routine, but even his rugged Western larynx was unequal to the demands of his avid Ohio audiences. He croaked out a thank you to the Clevelanders who had marched for two hours through rain and mud in his honor. He called the crisis an artificial one which would soon die of its own accord. Then he retired with an apology that he was too tired to indulge in further speechmaking. His fatigue, however, did not keep him from a public dinner and reception which continued until midnight.[40]

According to newspaper reports, Lincoln made a favorable impression in the Forest City. One observer liked his "plain and practical manner . . . free from all affectation." The editor of the *Leader,* Edwin Cowles, thought Lincoln's speeches were "as appropriate as his previous silence had been judicious." "Extempore remarks by a President-Elect," he said, "are delicate experiments." Even the editor of the *Plain Dealer,* who several days previously had compared Lincoln to "a pent up furnace that must blow off or burst up," now found words for a gracious compliment: "We must confess to being most favorably impressed with both Mr. Lincoln and his lady."[41]

Early next morning, Lincoln set out for Buffalo. In firing a farewell cannonade at Willoughby, William Hazen lost his arm because of a premature detonation. Unaware of the mishap, newspapermen aboard the Presidential special testified that in spite of the extremely bad weather, the Cleveland welcome was the most enthusiastic of the journey. At Westfield, New York, the reception committee had arranged a public interview between Old Abe and Miss Grace Bedell, the young lady who had suggested that whiskers might perhaps improve his appearance. Lincoln demonstrated his appreciation for her advice on cosmetology by tendering a discreet, but bristly, kiss, a touching incident which provided newsmen with columns of escapist commentary. As the Union disintegrated, editors found comfort in a journalistic dementia praecox which headlined the progress of Lincoln's whiskers. The Albany *Atlas & Argus,* for example, ridiculed the "brilliant intellectual powers" brought to bear upon their luxuriant cultivation. "Lincoln's vanity is excited to a morbid degree," said the *Argus.* "Everywhere he goes he talks about his looks" and "the consciousness of the effect of his whiskers seems to animate all his discourse."[42]

---

[39] *Ibid.*

[40] Cleveland *Leader,* February 15, 16, and 18, 1861; Cleveland *Plain Dealer,* February 16, 1861.

[41] Cleveland *Ohio Farmer,* February 23, 1861; Cleveland *Leader,* February 15 and 18, 1861; Cleveland *Plain Dealer,* February 16, 1861.

Since nineteenth-century political protocol made it inexpedient for a President to travel on Sunday, Lincoln enjoyed a brief rest in Buffalo, though he made a public appearance at the Unitarian Church with his host, former President Millard Fillmore. Greeley joined a group of welcoming New York dignitaries in Buffalo with a difficult assignment: to keep Lincoln beyond the earshot of Empire State conservatives. Monday morning, February 18, Mrs. Lincoln persuaded the prairie Railsplitter to discard his old hat and overcoat. After a day of whistle stops across up-state New York, he arrived in Albany in a "handsome broadcloth overcoat." He looks fifty per cent better, observed *The New York Times*; "and if Mrs. Lincoln's advice is always as near right as it was in this instance, the country may congratulate itself upon the fact that its President elect is a man who does not reject, even in important matters, the advice and counsel of his wife."[43]

Thurlow Weed, who had been working for a sectional compromise in Washington, hurried home to Albany "to instruct the President in 'speechmaking' during the balance of the journey."[44] Lincoln's host in the Empire State Capital, Edwin D. Morgan, was partner in a New York brokerage firm which held a half million shares of Missouri securities. His partner, a cousin, urged him to salvage something of the family's stake in the state of Missouri. "You will have the opportunity to learn from Mr. Lincoln . . . the tone of his views and intentions as to be stated in his inaugural," wrote the New York financier. "If you can give me your opinion in confidence I shall be enabled to act in matters important to our firm at once. If the Border Slave States are to be made reasonably contented, Missouri^{s} will rise, if not everything will fall. If you would telegraph me, (Yes) if Mr. Lincoln is for peace and Weed & Seward, and (No) if he is with Greeley and against concession . . . I shall be glad. . . . If Mr. Lincoln . . . does not now . . . conciliate, he has a civil war before him and a ruined country. . . ."[45]

The banner which greeted Lincoln in Albany was hardly designed to allay the financial uncertainties of the Governor's partner: "NO MORE COMPROMISES!" Nor did the crowd which dogged Lincoln facilitate private conversation designed to reveal the content of the inaugural address. When news did arrive, the Governor's communication was sufficiently ambiguous to require further advice. "I have your favor this morning," George Morgan replied. "Would it be best to force off our Missouri^{s} at 60 or below if we can [?]"[46]

Lincoln apparently aroused little enthusiasm in Albany. One conservative observer thought the crowd received him well, but not enthusiastically. The *Times* noted that he "appeared pale and worn." The *Atlas & Argus* was hostile, as usual: "While Mr. Lincoln carefully preserved silence, . . . the public accorded him the credit of withholding something too precious to be wasted! . . .

---

[42] Cleveland *Leader*, February 18, 1861; Albany *Atlas & Argus*, February 15, 19, 21, and 22, 1861.

[43] *New York Times*, New York *Semi-Weekly Tribune*, February 19, 1861; Cleveland *Leader*, February 18, 1861.

[44] John S. Williams to Gideon Welles, February 17, 1861, Gideon Welles MSS, Illinois State Historical Library.

[45] George D. Morgan to Edwin D. Morgan, February 16, 1861, Morgan MSS.

[46] *New York Times*, February 19, 1861; George D. Morgan to Edwin D. Morgan, February 19 and 21, 1861, Morgan MSS; Robert G. Gunderson, "Lincoln and Governor Morgan: A Financial Footnote," *The Abraham Lincoln Quarterly*, VI (1951), 431-37.

But lo! the wine is cut . . . and instead of sparkling champaign [*sic*] that bubbles over, there is a frothy rush of rootbeer, yeasty foam, inspired flatulence, slops and dregs." Even Republican papers began making excuses, claiming "a conspiracy among the news agents and telegraph operators to destroy Mr. Lincoln's reputation as a public speaker."[47]

From Albany, Lincoln proceeded to the Astor House in New York where he held a reception for the State Electoral College, various Republican committeemen, and Tom Heyer, the famous pugilist. Moses Grinnell favored him with a "very elegant breakfast." Weed reported the event to Seward: "I had an hour with Mr. L. yesterday. The conversation was confined to a single point, in relation to which I have no reason to suppose that he listened with profit. . . . His Inaugural is prepared, but I have no intimation of its character. I should like to tell you what was said, . . . but of course cannot on paper. My solicitude in reference to the Country is not diminished."[48]

Lincoln concluded his public travels with appearances in Trenton, Philadelphia, and Harrisburg. Fearing a conspiracy in Baltimore, his advisors persuaded him to finish the trip in secret. The Albany *Argus* insisted that they arranged the undignified flight to prevent further speechmaking, headlining the episode: "MORE ASS-ASS-INATION." "It is now pretty generally believed," said the *Argus* facetiously, "that Mr. Lincoln went to Washington by the Underground Railroad."[49]

During his widely heralded trip, Lincoln did little to enhance his reputation as a speaker. Only the brief farewell at Springfield gave evidence of his eloquence. After the Baltimore fiasco, many found it expedient to criticize him for forsaking his policy of eloquent silence. Edward Everett thought his speeches "the most ordinary kind destitute of every thing [,] not merely of felicity and grace, but of common pertinence." In the privacy of his diary, the onetime president of Harvard concluded that Lincoln was "evidently a person of very inferior cast of character, wholly unequal to the crisis."[50] Parson William G. Brownlow called most of Lincoln's speeches foolish. They "betray more weakness than we supposed he was capable of," concluded the devoted Tennessee Unionist.[51] "Lincoln is trotting through the free States like a lion on exhibition," said the Louisville *Democrat,* "but even in the little that he has said, he has shown only that instead of a real lion, he is an ass in lion's skin."[52] From aboard the Presidential special, Norman B. Judd got the impression that newspaper reports failed to reflect public opinion properly. "The demonstrations at all points have been imposing," he assured Senator Trumbull, "and whatever doubts may have existed as to the expediency of this journey would be entirely dispelled if the doubters could see what I have seen."[53]

---

[47] Edward W. Corning to Erastus Corning, February 19, 1861, Erastus Corning MSS, Albany Institute of History and Art; *New York Times,* February 19, 1861; Albany *Atlas & Argus,* February 19 and 20, 1861; Troy *Times,* Hartford *Press,* and Springfield *Republican,* (n. d.), quoted *ibid.,* February 22, 1861; Boston *Evening Transcript,* February 16, 1861.

[48] *New York Times,* February 20 and 21, 1861; Thurlow Weed to William H. Seward, February 21, [1861], William H. Seward MSS, University of Rochester Library.

[49] Albany *Atlas & Argus,* February 28 and March 5, 1861. For a full account see Norma B. Cuthbert, *Lincoln and the Baltimore Plot . . .* (San Marino, California, 1949).

[50] Edward Everett, MS Diary, February 15, 1861, Massachusetts Historical Society.

[51] Knoxville *Whig,* March 2, 1861.

[52] Louisville *Democrat,* February 13, 1861.

[53] Norman P. Judd to Lyman Trumbull, February 17, 1861, Trumbull MSS.

PRESIDENTIAL POWER: THE INFLUENCE OF BROADCASTING

Samuel L. Becker

IN his classic work on public opinion, Walter Lippmann makes this statement:

> If one had asked a philosophical democrat [among the founding fathers of the United States] how these self-contained communities were to cooperate, when their public opinions were so self-centered, he would have pointed to representative government embodied in the Congress. And nothing would surprise him more than the discovery of how steadily the prestige of representative government has declined while the power of the Presidency has grown.[1]

Lippmann attributes this shift in power to the presidential control of most of the fact-gathering agencies in the federal government. Equally tenable is the hypothesis that radio and television have contributed significantly in the past forty years to the shift in the balance of power from the Congress to the President. A consideration of this statement, and the evidence upon which it is based, may sharpen our perception of many activities of the new national administration.

Prior to the development of the electronic media which, in turn, created what Woodrow Wilson called "national information" and "national opinion," presidential powers tended to increase during periods of national crisis such as war or national depression, whereas Congressional powers increased relatively during other periods. However, broadcasting has tended to focus the attention of national audiences upon local or regional issues, literally making them into national crises. One can note, for example, the problem of school integration in the South or unemployment in Michigan and Illinois. These problems are thrust upon the nation-wide scene by the mass media and, therefore, upon the President. In this indirect way, broadcasting has pushed the President further up the pole of political power, relative to the Congress. In addition, until fairly recent times, the only contact an individual had with the federal government (aside from the post office and internal revenue departments) was with the Congressman from his district or one of his Senators on an occasional trip home mending political fences. The President was quite remote from the experiences of most citizens. In the struggle for dominance with the Congress, the President was at a distinct disadvantage. Most Congressmen maintained a constant and personal communication with their constituents. The President's constituents were the entire population and he had no way to maintain contact with all of them, except as the newspapers chose to publish what he said. However, he had little control over what the papers selected from his remarks to publish; he could not control whether they "screamed" his remarks on the front pages or "hid" them among the ads on an inside page. This is not to say that pre-electronic Presidents did not see the importance of communicating with the citizenry through the press. Theodore

---

Mr. Becker is Associate Professor of Speech, State University of Iowa, and Director, Division of Television-Radio-Film.

[1] Walter Lippmann, *Public Opinion* (New York, 1922), p. 287.

Roosevelt certainly saw this and made good use of the press to reach the people.[2] Woodrow Wilson attested to the need for communicating with the public when he wrote in 1908 that "one of the serious difficulties of politics in this country . . . is provincialism—the general absence of national information and, by the same token, of national opinion."[3] This idea was probably in his mind when Wilson started the first regular presidential press conferences on March 15, 1913.[4] However, in no sense was the press an adequate medium of communication, as Wilson discovered when he tried to go over the heads of the Congress to the people in order to sell the League of Nations. It has been stated that "if Wilson had been able to speak to the people via television or even radio, the course of world history might have been vastly different."[5] Wilson traveled more than 8,000 miles delivering 37 speeches to try to win support for the League.[6] Today, with one speech on radio and television, a President can reach virtually the entire population. As Paul Lazarsfeld has said, the very acoustics of our culture have been altered. An examination of the ways in which these changing acoustics have been utilized in the conduct of the Presidency may shed additional light on the increasing power of this office.

The first President to speak on radio was Woodrow Wilson. But this was in 1919 when the medium was still in an embryo state. The handful of radio pioneers listening could distinguish no more than a few clear words.[7]

The election of Warren Harding virtually coincided with the birth of modern radio, for the first successful broadcast, as we know it today, occurred in 1920 when it was decided to inaugurate broadcasting on radio station KDKA in Pittsburgh by announcing the returns of the presidential election.[8] Other stations also carried the news of the Harding landslide and the public suddenly realized that radio was a very practical communication tool.[9] Though President Harding spoke over the radio periodically throughout his administration, he injected radio most directly into the political life of the country with a series of broadcasts on his "stewardship of the Administration." These broadcasts occurred during his western tour in 1923.[10] The development of the radio medium during the three years of the Harding administration can be seen in the broadcasting arrangements made for this tour. The railroad car in which he traveled was specially outfitted with a powerful radio transmitter to broadcast his speeches to a large section of the country.[11] The first "presidential network" was set up so that the speech he made in St. Louis during this tour could be transmitted simultaneously by stations in other parts of the country.[12] His speech from Kansas City was also carried by a network of radio stations.[13]

---

[2] Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., *The Coming of the New Deal* (Boston, 1959), p. 561.

[3] Woodrow Wilson, *Constitutional Government in the United States* (New York, 1908), p. 126.

[4] Ray Stannard Baker, *Woodrow Wilson, Life and Letters* (Garden City, N. Y., 1931), IV, 229.

[5] Henry A. Turner, "Woodrow Wilson and Public Opinion," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, XXI (1957-1958), 511.

[6] *Ibid.*

[7] *New York Times*, November 2, 1930, Sec. 9, p. 10.

[8] Lloyd Morris, *Not So Long Ago* (New York, 1949), p. 439. News bulletins on the presidential election of 1916 were transmitted by the Lee De Forest experimental radio station. However, this was not a broadcast of the order of that heard over KDKA in 1920.

[9] *The Zenith Story, A History from 1919* (Chicago: Zenith Radio Corporation, n.d.), pp. 3-4.

[10] *New York Times*, June 25, 1923, p. 2.

[11] *Ibid.*, June 2, 1923, p. 13.

[12] *30 Years of Pioneering and Progress in Radio and Television* (New York: Radio Corporation of America, 1949), pp. 15-16.

Radio appeared ready for President Harding but Harding did not appear ready for it. The presence of a microphone during his speeches appeared to hinder rather than help him. The *New York Times* reported that on his western tour of 1923 Harding was seriously hampered by the microphone:

> He is dominated by the restraining influence of the radio-telephone amplifiers, into which he has talked in making all his set addresses. . . . With self-abnegation [he] has delivered himself . . . to the mastery of the instrument in front of him. . . . The mechanical contrivance worries him and . . . he is tempted at times to revert to the old style of direct oratory, more stimulating to both orator and audience.[14]

The *Times* indicated that Harding impressed people in close contact or in general platform speaking but not when he spoke on the radio. Radio "gives him an immense distant audience, but hampers him before his immediate hearers. It carries his message far, but cripples his oratory near by."[15]

A few days after Coolidge succeeded to the Presidency (at Harding's death), the National Broadcasters' Association proposed that he make use of radio to conserve his health and at the same time reach more listeners. The association pointed out that President Wilson's health was broken by his cross-country trip on behalf of the League of Nations. They also pointed out that President Harding made a similar trip, addressing large audiences through the West and Alaska on the subject of a World Court, and that the strain overtaxed his strength and resulted in his death in San Francisco.[16]

This pointed suggestion apparently found a willing target in Calvin Coolidge. It may come as a surprise to those who have been misled by the "Silent Cal" appellation that Coolidge was anything but silent. "During his first year in office, following the election in 1924, Mr. Coolidge made a total of 265 addresses, statements, and unofficial statements. During the same year he spoke on an average close to 9,000 words a month into the microphone."[17] It is estimated that more than 50,000 persons heard his voice over the radio during the first eight months of 1927.[18] He spoke to more people than any previous President in history. His voice was "probably heard by more people than ever heard the voice of all our [previous] Presidents combined, including the most strenuous, President [Theodore] Roosevelt, and the most traveled, President Taft."[19]

His contemporaries appeared unanimous in the opinion that radio seemed to have been invented for Coolidge. One person reported that "his voice is perfectly adapted to its use in an enunciation clear and distinct."[20] Another said that "the advent of radio must be listed as one more item in the total of Coolidge luck or destiny or whatever it is that seems to make things come right for him politically."[21] An American Telephone and Telegraph expert, who studied the public reaction to the broadcasting of the Republican convention of 1924, was quoted as saying that "President Coolidge has a great political asset in that he is extremely popular as a radio speaker."[22] This expert opinion was borne out by a popularity contest reported in a radio magazine of the mid-twenties. It showed that the President was rated fourth most popular radio artist of the day, following only John McCormack, Walter Damrosch, and Schumann-Heink, and well ahead of Will Rogers, who was ranked seventh.[23] Coolidge seemed to recognize both the suitability of the medium to him and the medium's political capabilities:

---

[13] *New York Times,* June 21, 1923, p. 1.

[14] *Ibid.,* June 25, 1923, p. 2.

[15] *Ibid.,* June 27, 1923, p. 18.

[16] *Ibid.,* February 24, 1924, Sec. 8, p. 15.

[17] *Ibid.,* September 4, 1927, Sec. 8, p. 11.

[18] *Ibid.*

[19] *Ibid.*

[20] C. Bascom Slemp, *The Mind of the President* (New York, 1926), p. 10.

[21] Democrat Charles Michelson, quoted in G. L. Archer, *History of Radio to 1925* (New York: The American Historical Society, Inc., 1938), p. 347.

[22] *New York Times,* June 17, 1924, p. 2. This was the first broadcast of a national nominating convention.

> I am very fortunate that I came in with the radio. I can't make an engaging, rousing, or oratorical speech to a crowd . . . but I have a good radio voice, and now I can get my messages across to them without acquainting them with my lack of oratorical ability or without making any rhetorical display in their presence.[24]

At another time he said that radio "should render possible a more complete understanding of our national problems."[25] During his years in the White House it seems clear that Coolidge's continual use of radio did much to bring his prophecy to fulfillment. Less obvious is the fact that, in doing this, he did much to increase the influence and the importance of the presidential office.[26]

This is not to say that Coolidge took full advantage of this power. He rarely took forthright stands on issues or tried to influence the Congress. For one thing, as he indicated, he tried to avoid conflict:

> Theodore Roosevelt was always getting himself in hot water by talking before he had to commit himself upon issues not well defined. It seems to me . . . public administrators would get along better if they would restrain the impulse to butt in or to be dragged into trouble. They should remain silent until an issue is reduced to its lowest terms, until it boils down into something like a moral issue.[27]

For another thing, Coolidge had a distaste for legislation. He thought there were already too many laws and that the salvation of the country lay rather in sound administration of existing laws.[28]

It is an anomaly that the man who presided over the early growth of modern radio, and who did much to shape it to its present form, added little to the presidential use of the medium when he assumed the Presidency in 1929. Herbert Hoover, while Secretary of Commerce from 1921 to 1929, developed the pattern of governmental control of broadcasting which helped to give the electronic media in this country their present patterns. It is a striking comment that the most famous radio event associated with his term as President is probably the time he was introduced to the radio audience by veteran announcer Harry Von Zell. On this occasion, Von Zell announced grandly, "Ladies and Gentlemen, the President of the United States, Hoobert Heever."[29] The only major radio-political landmark associated with the White House occupancy of this man, who was once known as the "Czar of Radio,"[30] is that the Republican Party, in 1928, for the first time adopted the policy of reserving the major share of its publicity budget for radio.[31]

The radio medium was growing rapidly; there were pressures for the President to use radio to speak to the people. Pressure even came indirectly from Congress. It was proposed in 1929, by Republican Senator Gerald Nye, that the government erect a super-power station in Washington for, among other things, broadcasting important debates in Congress.[32] This was to be a sort of audible *Congressional Record*. Though this project was abandoned, the audible *Congressional Record* was almost achieved over commercial radio. The 71st Congress set a record in broadcasting over 100 speeches on legislation. Every important piece of legislation was discussed on the air by at least one Congressman.[33] The President had little choice but to follow suit, if his case was to be heard. Though he did not enjoy speaking,[34] President Hoover took increasingly to the air. He spoke on the radio 10 times in 1929[35] and on 27 occasions in 1930.[36] In addition, almost all of his cabinet members made radio addresses during this period. Radio raised the potential power of the Presidency during the terms of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover. It did so almost without their help and, apparently, almost against their wishes.

---

[23] *New York Times,* September 4, 1927, Sec. 8, p. 11, and September 16, 1928, Sec. 12, p. 4.

[24] James E. Watson, *As I Knew Them* (Indianapolis, 1936), p. 239.

[25] Slemp, p. 197. Quoted from a speech delivered to delegates of a radio conference, October 8, 1924.

[26] See, for example, Elmer E. Cornwall, "Coolidge and Presidential Leadership," *Public Opinion Quarterly,* XXI (1957-1958), 265-278.

[27] William Allen White, *Puritan in Babylon* (New York, 1938), p. 433.

[28] Gamaliel Bradford, "The Genius of the Average—Calvin Coolidge," *Atlantic Monthly,* CXLV (January 1930), 8.

[29] "Pardon My Blooper," re-recording of famous radio and television errors (New York: Jay-Gee Record Company, Inc., n.d.).

[30] *New York Times,* September 18, 1928, Sec. 10, p. 17.

[31] Ralph D. Casey, "Republican Propaganda in the 1936-1937 Campaign," *Public Opinion Quarterly,* I (1937), 35.

It was Franklin Delano Roosevelt who first truly took advantage of this developing potential and raised the use of radio as an instrument for presidential power almost to the state of perfection. Many reasons have been put forth for the success of F.D.R.'s "fireside chats." The determination of causes for any historical event is a hazardous pursuit. However, it would seem clear that three factors were important in bringing the presidential use of radio to its peak during the Roosevelt administration. First of all, the time was ripe. The country was in a chaotic state; it needed a strong, unifying force; radio had attained a high degree of technical and production excellence so that it was now recognized as a mature medium, rather than an experimental toy; the country was now well enough saturated with radio receivers to make it physically possible to reach virtually the entire nation through radio; and the experience of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover indicated ways in which radio could be effectively used by a President.

Not only was the situation right for greatness in this area, the man was right. Roosevelt brought with him to the White House a talent for communicating through this medium which was, and still is, the envy of many professional radio performers. Broadcast officials, in selecting him as the best political speaker in the nation, noted especially his personality, sincerity, and excellent voice.[37] On March 4, 1933, many Americans heard the distinguished voice with the Eastern dialect for the first time. It was F.D.R.'s first inaugural address. This was the broadcast which included his now famous dictum, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself—nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance."[38] Many who heard these words will testify that F.D.R. had more than personality, sincerity, and an excellent voice. He was somehow able to communicate a sense of comfort—of reassurance.

That Roosevelt had speaking skill and the occasion to make full use of it is well known. Less acknowledged is the third factor which contributed to his development of radio as an instrument of policy, the philosophy of government to which F.D.R. held. He thought of the government as an educational system which tried to help the public to learn and to understand national problems so that they could help in the solution of these problems. As he put it, "the whole fate of what the Government is trying to do . . . depends . . . on an understanding of the program by the mass of the people."[39] Or, as he said another time, "I cannot go any faster than the people will let me."[40] One can see the importance he felt radio had in projecting this philosophy in his use of radio while he was in office, and, even more directly, in some of his statements. For example, prior to his election as President, he said that "amid many developments of civilization which lead away from direct government by the people, the radio is one which tends on the other hand to restore direct contact between the masses and their chosen leaders."[41]

---

[32] *New York Times,* May 12, 1929, Sec. 10, p. 21.

[33] *Ibid.,* August 17, 1930, Sec. 9, p. 9.

[34] *Ibid.,* October 28, 1928, Sec. 10, p. 1.

[35] *Ibid.,* December 29, 1929, Sec. 9, p. 11.

[36] *Ibid.,* December 28, 1930, Sec. 1, p. 1.

[37] *Ibid.,* August 2, 1934, p. 19.

[38] *Ibid.,* March 5, 1933, Sec. 1, p. 1.

The way in which he implemented this philosophy was apparent almost immediately after he assumed office. Eight days following his inauguration, he made the first of his fireside chats. His purpose was to calm public panic over the closing of the banks. The success of this radio speech motivated the *New York Times* to editorialize on the growing relative influence of the presidential office, due in large part to radio:

> His use of this new instrument of political discussion is a plain hint to Congress of a recourse which the President may employ if it proves necessary to rally support for legislation which he asks and which the lawmakers might be reluctant to give him.[42]

And Roosevelt did use the radio medium to rally support for legislation and for his policies. For example, in the summer of 1934 when criticism of the New Deal began to mount, he put the case to the people in the sort of personal terms which by then were familiar to fireside chat listeners:

> The simplest way for each of you to judge recovery lies in the plain facts of your individual situation. Are you better off than you were last year? Are your debts less burdensome? Is your bank account more secure? Are your working conditions better? Is your faith in your own individual future more firmly grounded?[43]

He used radio to gain support for his programs which needed voluntary cooperation from business, industry, or the public. For example, in the second of his fireside chats, he called for industry to cooperate with the government by preventing over-production, and by raising wages and improving working conditions.[44] He also used radio to explain his policies, as in his fourth fireside chat, when he explained his decision to have the government purchase gold at higher rates.[45]

Roosevelt spoke over the air 20 times during his first 10 months in office. Mrs. Roosevelt, incidentally, is credited with 17 radio addresses and the Roosevelt cabinet with 107 during this period. The heads of the various new government units were also heard from time to time.[46] As the American citizen struggled to climb out of the depression, and later as he faced the terror of war, President Roosevelt, through radio, was able to give him hope and understanding and to enlist his support. In doing this with the aid of radio, he clearly established an image of the President as one close to the people, as one who stood between the people and the Congress, and as one who represented the people in Washington and in the world.

---

[39] Schlesinger, p. 558. Quotation taken from a statement of the National Emergency Council Proceedings, December 17, 1935.

[40] Upton Sinclair, *I, Candidate for Governor and How I Got Licked* (Pasadena: Upton Sinclair, 1935), p. 78.

[41] Schlesinger, p. 559.

[42] *New York Times*, March 14, 1933, p. 14.

[43] *Ibid.*, June 29, 1934, p. 2.

[44] *Ibid.*, May 8, 1933, p. 1.

[45] *Ibid.*, October 23, 1933, p. 13.

[46] *Ibid.*, December 17, 1933, Sec. 1, p. 3.

Of course, perceptive members of Congress were aware that the growing influence of the President meant a diminishing influence for them. They were aware, too, of the role that radio played in this reversal. Republican Senator Arthur Robinson in 1934 tried to correct this situation. He charged in the Senate that the administration controlled the airwaves and that those who opposed the administration could not be heard.[47] But nothing could be done to turn the tide. There was no single voice which spoke for Congress. There was one which spoke for the administration. It was natural that the radio networks were more willing to give time to one President than to 96 Senators and 435 Representatives. Radio had developed economically, as well as technically, during the twenties and thirties. The problem of the broadcasters in the twenties had been to fill time. They were glad to have the free services of any government official, major or minor, who would show up at the studio. This situation had changed by the thirties. Advertisers with their entertainment programs were clamoring for air time, especially the choice evening hours when the so-called "mass audience" was listening. More important, the advertisers were willing to pay large sums of money for this time, and the broadcasters were reluctant to cancel sponsored programs to hear governmental officials. However, the broadcasting companies could hardly refuse when the President of the United States called to request the nine P.M. hour on Tuesday night. It was easier to refuse similar requests from Congressmen. (Needless to say, this situation continues on both radio and television.) In addition to these practical problems which tended to give the President easier access than the Congress to the airwaves, there was a psychological advantage; in contrast to the press, broadcasting seems to personalize issues. One tends to associate an issue with a man and then can identify with that man. Congress, as a body, is less amenable to such personalization than is the President.

Though the Presidents who followed Roosevelt did not face the spectacular domestic crises which lent added impact to almost everything F.D.R. did, though they did not have his speaking skill or hold so firmly to the philosophy of government he had, the personal image of the President as the people's representative, and the image of his role as that of initiator of the major legislation has remained.

This is not to say that Presidents Truman and Eisenhower failed to use radio and, later, television. The practice had been so firmly entrenched by the time of Roosevelt's death that they had little choice but to continue it. Not only did they continue it, however; they added their own variations. Truman's White House tenure will probably best be remembered in broadcast history for the ascendency of television. From this time on, though radio continued to be used, and most programs in which the President appeared were also broadcast on radio, the video medium became the dominant one in audience impact and, hence, in the thinking of those who were concerned with presidential broadcasts. The first television broadcast from the White House occurred on October 5, 1947, when President Truman and the chairman of the President's Food Conservation Program, Charles Luckman, asked the American people to cooperate in the program.[48] As the television medium matured in the late forties and early fifties, Truman insisted on full use of it in all of his major speeches.[49] However, Truman did not seem to use broadcasting consciously as a lever for increasing his influence on the Congress.

---

[47] *Ibid.*, January 19, 1934, p. 1.

Dwight Eisenhower entered the Presidency with what appeared to be convictions somewhat similar to those of Coolidge. His preference and background pointed more toward administration than legislation. However, the public image of the President as the leader of Congress, as well as of the nation, seems to have been so firmly implanted by this time that it was virtually impossible to reverse the tide. It is interesting to note, in this regard, that Eisenhower has been criticized more for inaction than for action. However, Eisenhower can not be criticized for inaction on the broadcast front. During his eight years in office, he adapted F.D.R.'s fireside chat technique to television. In addition, he added many of his own innovations to the presidential broadcasting relationship. He inaugurated the post of Presidential Television Advisor and appointed to it actor Robert Montgomery. Eisenhower was the first to allow radio and television broadcasting of parts of presidential press conferences.[50] His major innovation, however, was probably the televising of staged "Cabinet meetings." Though there was much criticism of the first of these broadcasts, many politicians on both sides of the aisle felt that it was a portent of the future.[51] Roosevelt developed the individual, personal, friendly, chat approach in presidential broadcasting. Eisenhower developed the conversation or discussion as a form of presidential electronic communication. Whereas Roosevelt achieved his intimate quality by speaking as though each listener were the sole audience, Eisenhower achieved it by what members of the broadcast industry call the key-hole technique. One of the best examples of this is the Eisenhower-Dulles telecast of May 17, 1955. The program was designed to give the appearance of an informal conversation. The President and the Secretary of State simply talked earnestly to each other, giving the television viewer the feeling of overhearing history in the making. As one columnist commented, "The convincing thing about their performance was that it didn't seem like a performance at all."[52]

As a new generation of politicians takes command of the White House, we are almost certain to see further innovations in the presidential use of broadcasting. Both President Kennedy and former Vice President Nixon, his opponent in the 1960 race, are children of the electronic age. They are as much at home in a radio or television studio as the politician of the nineteenth century was on a soapbox or the rear platform of a train. Kennedy's first major television trial came early in 1960 when his bid for the presidential nomination appeared to hinge on the West Virginia primary election:

> His most ominous problem was the state's massive and pervasive hostility to a Catholic candidate. Only the most full and personal kind of campaign—directly reaching and affecting tens of thousands—could counter popular passions so diffuse, so widespread. And only television made such an effort conceivable.[53]

---

[48] *Pioneering in Television* (New York: Radio Corporation of America, 1948), p. 114 and *New York Times*, October 6, 1947, pp. 1, 5.

[49] *New York Times*, June 25, 1951, p. 27.

[50] Douglas Cater, "The President in Your Living Room," *Reporter*, XII (March 24, 1955), 23-25. Mr. Cater assesses the advantages and disadvantages of televising presidential press conferences.

[51] *Newsweek*, XLIV (November 8, 1954), 25.

[52] *New Republic*, CXXXII (May 30, 1955), 22.

[53] Emmet John Hughes, "52,000,000 TV Sets—How Many Votes?" *New York Times*, September 25, 1960, Sec. 6, p. 23.

The crucial television test however was still ahead for both Kennedy and Nixon. It began the night of September 26, 1960, when an estimated seventy-five million persons watched the first of the "great debates." If leading Democrats and Republicans agree on little else, they seem agreed that these joint television appearances tipped the scales for Kennedy. Democratic campaign manager Robert Kennedy has said "I don't think that it would have been close without the debates."[54] Former President Eisenhower is reported to have told intimates just before the election that "many of Nixon's troubles could be attributed to the 'mistake' of agreeing to the TV debates."[55] Even President Kennedy, at his first news conference after the election, said that he did not think that he could have won without the television debates.[56] This knowledge of television's potential political influence, coupled with President Kennedy's apparent determination to marshall all of the available means for increasing presidential power, indicate that broadcasting will continue to be a force in the trend toward a larger and more effective presidential role.

Kennedy's first hint of a broadcasting innovation came a month before his inauguration, when Press Secretary Pierre Salinger announced that occasional presidential press conferences may be broadcast live.[57] This plan was confirmed three weeks later, after the major television and radio networks had agreed to it. Salinger reaffirmed that the President would begin each broadcast conference with a statement and then be open to questions from reporters.[58] The potential of this procedure for increasing Kennedy's influence on legislation is clear. By requesting live coverage, he can not only insure that his point of view is broadcast at a time when there is a large available audience, but also insure that all of his point of view is broadcast. With the taping or filming of press conferences for later broadcasts, as was done during the Eisenhower administration, the President has no control over the time of broadcast or whether the total conference is carried (most stations carried only the highlights of the Eisenhower conferences as part of their regular newscasts). By using a type of press conference, rather than simply giving a speech, Kennedy will also increase the drama and interest in the presentation and, therefore, the size of the audience. His power to influence public opinion and, hence, influence Congress will be greatly enhanced.

This brief history of the presidential use of radio and television shows not only the increasing use of the media, but the increasingly *professional* use of them by our Presidents during the past forty years. From their comments, both spoken and written, and their actions there appears also an increasing recognition of the important role which radio and television can play in the conduct of the Presidency. From the reactions of members of Congress and the public, we sense a shift in the balance of power from the Congress to the President which we must attribute in some part to the ability of the President, through using these media, to greatly influence public opinion by speaking directly to each individual in the population.

---

[54] *Weekly Television Digest,* November 14, 1960, p. 5.

[55] *Ibid.*

[56] *Ibid.*, p. 1.

[57] *New York Times,* December 7, 1960, p. 37.

[58] *Ibid.*, December 28, 1960, p. 49.

ADOLPHE MONOD ON THE DISTRUSTED CANON

Albert T. Martin

I.

THE decades following the French Revolution were critical ones for Christianity in France. Catholics and Protestants alike waged a vigorous campaign against secular humanism and rationalism which had swept through France before the Revolution and now threatened the churches' existence. Scholarly allies in *le réveil,* as the religious counter-campaign was called, wrote technical manuals to instruct priests and ministers in the effective use of the churches' two major weapons of verbal warfare, the press and the pulpit. Yet, for reasons later to be examined, the press emerged in these manuals as the favorite weapon. When treating communications, the books on homiletics, dialectics, and pastoral theology usually stressed writing skills in invention, disposition, and style, and de-emphasized or neglected entirely the canon for translating ideas into speech, i.e., delivery. For instance, the most influential Protestant homiletician of his era, Alexandre Vinet, ignored delivery in his long tract on preaching yet spent seven chapters on disposition and four on style.[1] The spoken word, which Vinet called the "external form," was not to be trusted. Since preaching was, however, an unavoidable part of church services, Vinet, like many other homileticians, advised young preachers to concentrate on polishing their sermon texts for publication after the necessary pulpit reading. As to the reading or speaking itself, Vinet suggested that preachers perform perfunctorily and at all costs "avoid a theatrical, very familiar, excessively free manner."[2] Archdeacon Blunt counseled his charges to "be natural" with a negative emphasis scarcely analogous to the secular elocutionists who said the same words but usually assumed naturalness to be a result of and not a substitute for technique.[3] That such negative advice often resulted in flat, uninspired, and uninspiring preaching was observed by many. Dean Swift's earlier lament on the deplorable state of pulpit speaking as it existed in England was but one of many criticisms of a widespread "publish-or-worth-nothing" school of homiletics.[4]

Yet post-revolutionary France did not entirely lack preachers who were sensitive to the popular appeal of lively elocution. The multitudes who, Vinet lamented, were always "influenced by what is external" crowded to the long-vacated churches to hear those few preachers who ignored intellectual snobbery of the "external form" and preached with vitality. Two such preachers were unexcelled. Throughout the reign of Louis Philippe and through part of the reign of Louis Napoleon, the Protestant Adolphe Monod (d. 1856) and the Catholic Jean Baptiste Lacord-

---

Mr. Martin is Associate Professor of Speech, DePaul University, Chicago.

[1] Alexandre Vinet, *Homiletics, or the Theory of Preaching* ([Paris, 1853], Edinburgh, 1858).

[2] Alexandre Vinet, *Pastoral Theology, or the Theory of the Evangelical Ministry* ([Paris, 1850], New York, 1866), p. 218.

[3] Hugh T. Henry, *Papers on Preaching* (Philadelphia, 1925), p. 120.

[4] *Ibid.* See also Henry N. Day, "The Training of the Preacher," *American Biblical Repository* (July 1842), 71-90.

aire (d. 1861) reigned uncontested in the pulpits of their respective churches.[5] Whereas Lacordaire served the homiletical tradition chiefly by his preaching example, Monod was both exemplar and theorist, preacher and teacher. And it is in this latter service as homiletician that Monod is considered in this study.

2.

The learned nineteenth-century critic of preaching, John Broadus, considered Adolphe Monod not only the ablest French preacher of his time but one of the greatest preachers that the century had produced in any language.[6] Monod, through his ability to communicate effectively to the uneducated as well as to that intellectual elite who usually held themselves aloof from popular persuasion, attained what one historian called the "highest point of homiletical achievement."[7]

Unlike many of his contemporaries, Monod concerned himself as much with the delivery of his sermons as with their content, organization, and style. He digested the elocutionary theory of his time and became its masterful exponent. Elocutionary skill played a significant part in Monod's ability to communicate on a popular level and provided a forceful counter-example to those preachers who snubbed the canon. "Cultivate elocution as a means of glorifying God and doing good to man," Monod urged fellow preachers and students. Listeners nurtured on the drones of perfunctory preachers were stunned by Monod's "unorthodox energy" in bulldozing through "the limits of gentleness."[8] His popularity was unexcelled and his eminence in the Protestant pulpit uncontested. Crowds from every social and intellectual station packed the long-vacated churches of Lyons, Montauban, and Paris to hear him preach. Even his Catholic rival, the celebrated Lacordaire, admitted that beside Monod he and all preachers were as mere children.[9]

With the urge to help prepare competent ministers for *le réveil,* Monod in 1836 accepted an offer to teach scripture and homiletics in the theological studium at Montauban. He set practical utility as a paramount aim of his teaching. Skilled communicators were needed for the verbal warfare, and experience had taught him the salutary results to be gained from vigorous preaching. Monod realized the importance of training his seminarians to use well the distrusted delivery skills, tools too valuable to be ignored for the work ahead. "It is vain," he declared, "to say that this [delivery] is an affair of mere form, about which the Christian orator should not much concern himself."[10] Ignoring the prejudices of his fellow professors, Monod taught the elocutionary skills of which he was master. In 1840 he delivered before students and faculty of Montauban a monumental apologia entitled "Discours sur le Débit Oratoire" in which he synthesized his experience and knowledge of delivery and thereby added a piece of "vivid originality and native truth" to the distrusted stepchild of homiletical theory.[11]

---

[5] For a comparison of these two preachers see Louis Comte, *Étude Homilétique sur la Prédication Contemporaine*: *Adolphe Monod et Lacordaire* (Geneva, 1882).

[6] John Broadus, *Lectures on the History of Preaching* (New York, 1889), pp. 182-3.

[7] E. C. Dargan, *A History of Preaching,* II (Grand Rapids, 1954), 460. For an appraisal of Monod's pre-eminence in nineteenth-century French preaching see also, Broadus, *Lectures,* pp. 182 ff.; Dargan, *History,* II, 456 ff.; Herzog-Plitt-Hauck, *Real-Encyklopädie für Protestanische Theologie und Kirche,* X (Leipzig, 1882), 224-229; *Life and Letters of Adolphe Monod Pastor of the Reformed Church of France,* by one of his daughters [Sarah Monod] (London, 1885); Edmond De Pressense, *Contemporary Portraits,* trans. Annie H. Holmden (New York, 1880), pp. 149-230.

[8] De Pressense, pp. 171-172.

[9] Dargan, *History,* II, 460.

[10] Adolphe Monod, "The Delivery of Sermons," trans. James W. Alexander, in *Select Discourses,* ed. H. C. Fish and D. W. Poor (New York, 1858), pp. 395-396. Hereafter cited as Monod.

3.

Distrust of cultivating delivery skills was expressed and implied by men of the cloth, statesmen, literators, and journalists. In an age clouded with Puritanism and tainted with Manacheeism it is not surprising, however, that the major criticisms of elocutionary skill should come from men of the cloth, whose training especially predisposed them against any "external form" of popular excitation. There were numerous and overlapping prejudices besetting the preacher who cultivated elocutionary skill. Vanity, theatricalism, intellectual prostitution, lack of proper faith, and superficiality were among the charges often hurled at the elocutionary preacher. In this study the case against delivery in nineteenth-century homiletics is analyzed to show how Monod in his lecture met these attitudes and controverted them.

ATTITUDE 1. *A polished delivery is theatrical and consequently out of place in preaching.*

"It is theatrical to use action," said Sydney Smith as he enjoined against contamination with theatre witchcraft.[12] Smith and his associates would have jettisoned both the actor and the actor's art as useless to the preacher. An age which considered the actor as little more than an outcast vagabond would scarcely recommend him as a model for its men of God to emulate. But apart from the risk of being identified with the disreputable actor himself, many homileticians thought it no less dangerous to study the actor's craft. To a century ignorant of ghostwriters, when a man was expected to form his own ideas, to mean them, and, of course, to sound as though he meant them, the art of assuming passions which were not one's own was thought a frivolous occupation. "Seek honest gains, without pretense," Goethe's Faust warned preachers. And the effects of an actor's posturizing were not considered honest gains.

The fear of losing self-identity and assuming an artificial persona was almost a phobia with homileticians. "Are you speaking in your own person, or are you playing a part?" Vinet was "tempted to demand" of one popular preacher.[13] The preacher might come to "personate himself," warned Richard Whately. "Nothing surely can be more preposterous," he declared, "than laboring to acquire the art of *pretending* to be what he [the preacher] is *not*. . . ."[14] Archdeacon Blunt intimated that it was a moral offense to develop skill in delivery, because skill required calculation, which leads to self-consciousness and that, he reminded ministers, "is a form of selfishness." For "to be occupied with thoughts of self in the midst of the highest of all services is . . . to be in peril of putting self before God."[15] Thus any preacher so effusive in vocal and physical communication as to suggest the chemistry of acting was vulnerable to the slandering remark: "He should have been an actor."

Despite the homiletical prejudice

---

[11] For bibliographical assessment of Monod's lecture see: John Broadus, *A Treatise on the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons* (New York, 1926), p. 545; E. C. Dargan, *The Art of Preaching in the Light of its History* (Nashville, 1922), p. 189; Fish and Poor, *Select Discourses*, p. 395*n*.

[12] Henry, *Papers*, p. 129.

[13] Homiletics, p. 343.

[14] *Elements of Rhetoric*, 7th ed., rev. (London, 1846), Part IV, chap. iv, sec. 2, 380. See Wayland M. Parrish, "Whately on Elocution," *The Rhetorical Idiom*, ed. Donald C. Bryant (Ithaca, 1958), pp. 47 ff.

[15] Henry, *Papers*, p. 120.

against the actor, Monod would not jettison him without a hearing. An eclectic who freely borrowed elocutionary techniques that might be useful to preachers, Monod marvelled at the actor Talma's "prodigious faculty" for expressing "sentiments which were not [his] own, but which [he] appropriate[d] in imagination."[16] Aware of the tightrope he had to walk in order to make any part of the actor's tainted art palatable to his hearers, Monod first struck at the root of the prejudice (i.e., the actor himself) and then extracted the useful information (the actor's art).

There is "a distinction to be observed," said Monod, between the actor and the preacher. Whereas the latter need only "express the sentiments which he actually experiences . . . the former must express the sentiments of another."[17] The actor's art was therefore more a matter of native talent, whereas the preacher's craft was more a matter of intellectual cultivation. Consequently, since the preacher depended less "on certain natural dispositions which are altogether peculiar" and more on intellectual skill, the preacher's task was "more noble and less complicated." Nevertheless, Monod believed the actor's art should not go unheeded by the preacher. In speaking of concentration on the idea as the chief means of arriving at natural expression, he acknowledges Talma as a model reflector of "the intonations which nature communicates to sentiment and reason."

Although he dismissed Talma the man (a genius "squandered on vanities" who "wrote nothing of importance on his art"), Monod defended Talma the artist. His natural tones and deportment, derived from the "inflections of his soul," were examples for self-conscious preachers. Observe how Talma never allowed himself to get in the way of his art, Monod pointed out to his auditors. Always this artist used his voice and body "only as docile instruments, destined to reproduce the internal impressions." And it was this art which Monod believed preachers should emulate.

It is one's motive in approaching the study of elocution, Monod reminded his listeners, not the art itself that may be suspect. If the preacher has "no higher aim than recitation itself, and those praises which the world lavishes on such as speak well," then he is merely an actor.[18]

ATTITUDE 2. *Because it is a superficial tool of popular persuasion, skill in delivery is not worth serious attention.*

Many in the nineteenth century believed that intellectuals conceived ideas in seclusion, arranged and composed their thoughts privately, and then articulated them for public consumption. The judicious consumer also wanted privacy to absorb these thoughts. Since the printed word was the only medium that allowed time and solitude to both the thinker and the recipient of ideas, it was generally considered the highest and most sagacious form of communication. Other forms like plays, cartoons, and public oratory were dismissed as meant for illiterates "too lazy and stupid to read." Indeed the "man of letters who [threw] his voice and personal appearance into the scale [was] usually distrusted" along with the other mountebanks who trod the boards for fees.[19] Because they also spoke in public, many clergymen, sensing the stigma of this association with the public entertainers, preached lamely with "dignified tameness . . . amidst whole acres and furlongs of empty pews. . . ."[20] Daniel Kidder objected to these "lofty pretensions" as unbecoming men of God. When they preach, said Kidder, "they take care to let you know that it is a peculiar condescension; a descent or ascent to surface ideas quite out of their common course."[21] Convinced that men of serious purpose should spend little or no time in acquiring such a superficial skill, many homileticians gave delivery small attention in tracts on preaching.

---

[16] Monod, p. 397.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 396.

[18] Monod, pp. 395-405, *passim.*

[19] *New York Times,* November 15, 1872, p. 5.

Monod countered this prejudice by emphasizing the role which intellect plays in effective expression and by stressing the importance of good delivery to the preacher. That the "state of mind has more to do with [delivery] than is commonly thought" Monod considered "an experimental fact, which cannot be contested."[22] By communicating his "thoughts and feelings in a suitable, just, and expressive manner," Monod believed the preacher was simply indicating sharp intellectual and emotional grasp of his subject. To express poorly "what has been meditated without extraordinary pains" revealed flabby thinking and insincerity. Yet Monod would not agree with those who said "that they need[ed] nothing in order to make them excellent speakers, but to be themselves."[23] An experienced practitioner himself, Monod realized that preaching required a "continuity and elevation which does not belong to mere conversation. . . ." Why else, he asked, do some "often manifest in animated conversation many of the very qualities which we miss in their pulpit exercises. . . ?" Monod considered Whately's dictum to just "be natural" provided preachers with an easy excuse for acedia. "There must be some calculation of measures, management of voice, and strengthening of intonations," he said. In short, "there must be self-observation."[24]

Although he believed this "physical part" of delivery needed emphasis in homiletics, Monod considered precise concentration and reflection upon the material equally important. Whereas practical self-observation obtained for the preacher self-possession of his faculties enabling him to express "just what he intends, and just as he intends," no "capacity of lungs" substituted "for labor of reflection and energy of sentiment. . . ."[25]

Nor should the importance of delivery in Christian apologetics be underestimated, Monod warned. "Among all human means," he told his listeners, "there is no one which contributes more to fix the attention of men, and to move their hearts."[26] This was no superficial accomplishment to be eschewed for more pretentious goals, but a rigorous mental and physical discipline acquired only by dedicated men concerned with fulfilling their mission.

ATTITUDE 3. *By reason of his spiritual vocation the preacher should not concern himself with the external forms of communication.*

Concern for the skillful use of the means as such in Christian apologetics was generally suspect. This "unconscious Manicheeism" as De Pressense calls it[27] seems to emerge in three arguments: (1) that the preacher should concern himself only with the final end (i.e., God's truth) and leave the means (e.g., delivery) to God; (2) that true faith would project itself without conscious technique; (3) that there is no relation between a man's spiritual conviction and learning and his facility of expression.

---

[20] Henry, *Papers,* p. 129.

[21] Daniel Kidder, *A Treatise on Homiletics* (New York, 1864), p. 395.

[22] Monod, p. 396.

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 397.

[24] *Ibid.*

[25] *Ibid.*, pp. 398-399.

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 395.

[27] *Contemporary Portraits,* pp. 184-5.

It was questioned whether a true believer should not concentrate entirely on the ultimate ends of life and leave the human means to divine discretion. Some believed that serious cultivation of apologetical means, especially of obvious externals, might actually indicate lack of faith. Was it necessary, therefore, or even prudent for the preacher to learn to speak well? Advocates of this rationale defended it vigorously. Fernand Mourret viewed elocutionary training as a perpetrator of apostolic simplicity,[28] Orestes Brownson thought such skills covered up the preacher's humility,[29] and Archdeacon Blunt considered its cultivation as downright vain.[30]

Frequently slighted by homileticians and often neglected entirely in seminary training, the exercise of effective delivery skills was deemed an impediment to pious preachers. For although devout men might "transgress . . . propriety or deviate from . . . conventional rule," the disparagers of the means preferred these "meek and humble-minded who [thought] only of Christ" to the "accomplished pulpit orators."[31] It became even "a matter of principle," says De Pressense, for preachers "to be careless of the forms of speech" for fear of "allowing the least part to the human element in the work of conversion. . . ."[32]

This most deeply rooted of all the prejudices against cultivating delivery, Monod handled skillfully. Although he concentrated most fully on the third vaguely articulated yet widely held assumption that power of expression was unrelated to depth of faith and learning, he also dealt with the "leave-the-means-to-God" and the "faith-conveys-itself" arguments. Monod tactfully controverted each of these rationalizations persuasively through materials which, on the surface, were largely expository: materials treating the *importance* of good delivery, and the *vocal* and *physical,* and the *mental* techniques for acquiring it.

"True piety does not forbid the use of the natural faculties which God has allotted," insisted Monod as he sought to replace the notion of abstention from using means with the idea of consecrating them.[33] By stressing the parable of the talents, Monod effectively combated such views as that expressed by Mourret, who argued that since Christ and His apostles did not study elocution to discover whether "this formula, [or] this gesture were proper to express" the true "feeling[s] of their religious soul," the preacher should imitate Christ and concentrate only on His message.[34] Unlike Blunt, who considered elocution indicative of pride, Monod thought the refusal to use one's allotted talents "for His glory, and the good of [the] race" audacious. Acquire these skills "in a Christian spirit," he counseled, thereby emphasizing that it was motive rather than means which should be assessed. "Let the art of recitation be with you, not an end, but a means."[35]

---

[28] Henry, *Papers,* p. 123.

[29] Hugh T. Henry, *Preaching* (New York, 1941), p. 144.

[30] Henry, *Papers,* p. 120.

[31] Henry, *Preaching,* p. 144.

[32] *Contemporary Portraits,* pp. 184-5.

[33] Monod, p. 396.

[34] Henry, *Papers,* p. 123.

[35] Monod, p. 396. The disparagement of means in Christian apologetics is still discussed. Two contemporary statements by Etienne Gilson and Yves Congar concur with Monod's proposition. ". . . piety never dispenses with technique," says Gilson. "For technique is that without which even the most lively piety is incapable of using nature for God." *Gilson Reader* (New York, 1957), p. 40. In his *Lay*

Concerning *vocal* technique Monod countered the "faith-conveys-itself" view by pointing out the universal plight of faithful persons in any situation who lack full control of their faculties. Regardless of faith and learning, he reminded his audience, "it is not always the ablest who best extricates himself; it is commonly he who keeps himself cool. . . ." So it is with preaching. Unless he has acquired the "self-possession" which comes only through technical mastery, i.e., vocal and physical flexibility, the preacher, "no longer in that pure simplicity where nature displays and acts itself forth unreservedly," encounters a "miserable timidity" and then "all is lost."[36]

Monod spends over a third of his treatise on the *mental* technique of delivery in which he attempts to correlate depth of faith and intellect with power of expression. Although he planted this idea earlier in treating the intellectual part of delivery, he develops it more deeply in this latter portion by stressing that faith and conviction are mirrored in oral expression. Assuming a disciplined voice and body (those "intermediates between the mind of him who speaks and the mind of him who hears"), Monod proposes that only from the deepest recesses of mind and heart can come those "just inflections" and "true intonations" which are recognized "from one nation and idiom to another. . . ."[37] Genuine expression cannot be superimposed but comes in direct proportion to man's capacity to grasp it within himself. Monod developed this audacious correlation between conviction and expression (audacious at least to the mumblers and pedants who heard or read his lecture), by demonstrating how four universal goals of preaching (naturalness, simplicity, variety, and unity), usually treated under the more trusted canons of style and disposition, could be acquired in delivery only *ex anima,* i.e., by searching the deepest resources of human intellect and conviction.[38]

Naturalness and *simplicity,* for instance, cannot be achieved, Monod believed, by merely imitating "the accents of conventional artifice, or of arbitrary choice. . . ." Only by exploring their minds and hearts can preachers arrive at those "primitive" tones "which all men recognize as truthful." For unless the vocal expression is motivated by deep and spiritual thought, the amplified tone which has to be extended and elevated to project in church would sound false and declamatory. *Variety* rooted in "the marvelous flexibility of the human mind" comes not by "excessive action and abrupt transitions" but cautiously through a "step by step" tracking of "thought and sentiment in their infinite sinuosities. . . ." If there can be no true variety without precise and deep concentration, certainly there can be no *unity* which combines and subordinates all the parts to project the thought alone. The means must serve to effect the end; "it is the thought which should always appear, and always in its unity." This is the *récitation d'ensemble* in which all the techniques of communication combine to convey a total impact whereby attention turns "away from the orator, and fixes . . . upon what he says. . . ." Hence it follows, Monod concluded, "that it is by [the] assiduous labor" of vocal and physical exer-

---

People in the Church (Westminster, 1957), p. 370, Congar develops the concept of "christofinalising" the means which distinguishes between "the end of the work itself and the end of him who does the work" yet stresses the importance of means in effecting the end of both.

[36] Monod, pp. 397-399, *passim.*

[37] *Ibid.*, p. 404.

[38] *Ibid.*, p. 405.

1.

Superficially, Taoism is essentially anti-rhetorical. "In much talk there is great weariness. It is best to keep silent." This is the theme of the fifth of the 81 poems that comprise the *Tao-Teh-Ching*.[4] "Root out your preachers, discard your teachers, and the people will benefit a hundredfold," reads part of the unusually rich 19th verse. "Wise is the man who teaches by deeds, not by words," we are advised in verse two and in verse 43 we are told that "The best instruction is not in words." Moreover, says verse 72, "The wise man knows himself, but does not reveal his inmost thoughts." Since, according to verse 81, "True words may not sound fine and fine words may not be true," verse 73 warns, "It is not in words that God gets answers." For such reasons, verse 43 declares that "the greatest eloquence is like stuttering," and verse 81 advises that "A good man does not argue." Justifying his pacifism, in verse 43 Lao-tzu avers that "If you do not quarrel, no one on earth will be able to quarrel with you"; in verse 81 he notes gallantly that "The female always overcomes the male by her stillness."

Will Durant, accepting the apparently anti-rhetorical implications of Taoism, offers this summation of Lao-tzu's philosophy:

> Knowledge is not virtue; on the contrary, rascals have increased since education spread. Knowledge is not wisdom, for nothing is so far from a sage as an "intellectual." The worst conceivable government would be by philosophers; they botch every natural process with theory; their ability to make speeches and multiply ideas is precisely the sign of their incapacity for action.[5]

Still further supporting this anti-rhetorical interpretation is the passage in verse 81 of the *Tao-Teh-Ching* which reads in part: "Those who are skilled do not dispute; the disputations are not skilled. . . . The sage constantly keeps the people without knowledge and without desire; and where there are those who have knowledge, he prevents them from presuming to act. . . . He who tries to govern a state by his wisdom is a scourge to it, while he who does not do so is a blessing."[6]

So far as this analysis goes, the conclusion is that Taoism, rather than being a guide to rhetorical effectiveness, is an argument against rhetoric. But, left at this point, analysis has not proceeded far enough.[7]

2.

An accepted translation for the title of Lao-tzu's book is "The Canon of the Way and of Virtue." Its principal teaching, as interpreted by H. G. Creel, the University of Chicago Sinologist, is that we "should be in harmony with, not in rebellion against, the fundamental laws of the universe."[8] The question remains of how to achieve this harmony. Despite his renunciation of teaching, Lao-tzu himself was a teacher—as were his chief disciples, Chuang-tzu and Yang Chu. By precept and example, these molders of Taoism taught a way of life, a system of conduct, an interpretation of personality, a manner of dealing with oneself and one's fellows. Since the influencing of men was their chosen mission, we cannot take seriously the disclaimer of Chuang-tzu:

---

[4] References are to verse numbers rather than to specific editions, of which the following have been used for cross reference: J. Legge, *Texts of Taoism,* 2 vols. (Oxford, n.d.); Laou Tsze, *Taoist Teachings from the Book of Lieh Tzu* (New York, 1912); Lionel Giles, ed., *Sayings of Lao Tzu,* 4th ed. (New York, 1947); Witter Bynner, *The Way of Life According to Lao Tzu* (New York, 1944); Lin Yutang, trans. and ed., *Wisdom of Lao-tzu* (New York: Modern Library, 1948); Ch'u Takao, trans., *Tao-Te-Ching,* 4th ed. (London, 1945); and J. J. L. Duyvendak, *The Book of the Way and Its Virtue,* new trans. with annotations (New York: Wisdom of the East series, 1954).

[5] Will Durant, *Our Oriental Heritage* (New York, 1935), p. 653.

[6] E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Boston, 1957), p. 211, points out that Plato, in his late works, *Politics* and *The Laws,* also came to doubt the advisability of government by a "philosopher king." Perhaps it was insight of the Taoist sort that led Thomas Jefferson to conclude that "That government is best which governs least." One reason for Taoist skepticism is that intelligence and education, instead of barring rationalization, make it more intricate and believable. See my *Psychology of Persuasive Speech* (New York, 1958), chap. xiii.

[7] Similarly, Plato is sometimes said to have been "against rhetoric." But cf. Richard Weaver's "The Phaedrus and the Nature of Rhetoric," *The Ethics of Rhetoric* (Chicago, 1953), pp. 3-26.

> *Tao* cannot be heard. Heard, it is not *Tao*. It cannot be seen. Seen, it is not *Tao*. It cannot be spoken. Spoken, it is not *Tao*. That which imparts form to forms is itself formless; therefore, *Tao* cannot have a name. What there was before the universe was *Tao*. *Tao* makes things what they are, but it is not itself a thing.[9]

Unquestionably, "that which imparts form to forms" is rhetoric. It is, to borrow a phrase from Ralph Waldo Emerson, "the art of putting things." Taoism is a mode of interpreting facts and an explication of motivational factors; it is precisely for this reason that for over a millenium it exercised enormous influence and is once again coming into prominence. Far different from the rhetoric of Aristotle, it merits examination not alone for whatever vision of truth it may represent but also because (regardless of its validity) it shaped and now is helping to reshape the nature of the communion and communication of millions of individuals in that Orient with which we must somehow learn how to come to terms. This importance is stressed by Professor David Nelson Rowe, who, in summing up the nature of Chinese civilization, concluded: "Thus, skill in the use of words, and reliance upon subjective mental processes, came to characterize the ruling bureaucracy of China through the ages."[10]

Lin Yutang had no question that the *Tao-Teh-Ching* is a book of rhetoric, but his thumbnail sketch of its rhetorical significance (which must have been extremely casual) seems to me to be misleading. He calls it "the first enunciated philosophy of camouflage in the world"; and he declares, "it teaches the wisdom of appearing foolish, the success of appearing to fail,[11] the strength of weakness and the advantage of lying low, the benefit of yielding to your adversary and the futility of contention for power." He adds that "If one reads enough of this Book one automatically acquires the habits and ways of the Chinese."[12] Whatever may be the merit of his interpretation, the last sentence is indeed high tribute to the rhetorical power of Taoism. Noting the profoundly ethical character of the work, Yutang quotes from verse 61: "The virtuous man is for patching up, the vicious man for fixing guilt." In this sense, Yutang believes, the "philosophy of camouflage" is justified.

3.

Among the difficulties of interpreting the rhetoric of Lao-tzu, the first is the question of when or even of whether he may have lived. Lin Yutang confidently notes his birth date as "about 570 B.C."[13] Will Durant avoids specifying any date but agrees with the traditional view that he was "pre-Confucian."[14] If Yutang's date is accepted, Lao-tzu was almost an exact contemporary with both Confucius and Gautama Buddha. Creel, on the other hand, points out that the *Tao-Teh-Ching* contains ideas that can only be refutations of later abuses of Confucianism. Noting also that the work contains contradictions and differences of style, he believes that Lao-tzu probably never existed, that if he did his dates are some two centuries later than formerly supposed, and that rather than being an individual philosopher he was in effect (like Homer) a composite of preceding thinkers.[15] The traditional view, at any rate, is that Lao-tzu, past the age of eighty, weary of his work as Curator of the Royal Library, and disgusted with the knavery of the Court of Chou, sought to flee from the kingdom. The warden of the frontier guard, Yin Hsi, stopped him and insisted that before he could depart he must write down his wisdom as precepts for the people.[16] Whatever may have been its origin, the *Tao-Teh-Ching* is a unique contribution to the understanding of the mysterious ways of human conduct.

---

[8] H. G. Creel, *Chinese Thought from Confucius to Mao Tse-tung* (originally University of Chicago Press, 1953, but I have used the Mentor edition, New York, 1960), p. 88.

[9] Cited by Mary L. Nourse, *A Short History of the Chinese* (New York: New Home Library, 1942), p. 63.

[10] David N. Rowe, *Modern China: A Brief History* (New York, 1959), p. 26.

[11] For a modern interpretation of this theme by a French woman well-schooled in Orientalism, cf. Simone de Beauvoir, *The Ethics of Ambiguity* (New York, 1948).

[12] Lin Yutang, p. 579.

[13] *Ibid.*

The *Tao* is generally translated as "the Way." It is presented as *the way* to find one's true relations to eternal and immutable essence. The chief guideposts along this way are "wu-wei" (avoidance of action), "wu-hsin" (negation of mind), and "te" (the principle of spontaneous functioning).[17] In verse 4 of the *Tao-Teh-Ching* the Way is called "a preface to God," and in verse 9 the goal is identified as peace. As nearly as we can paraphrase it in American terms, the meaning of the Way seems to be that *to do* is nothing; *to be* is all. It seems akin to the pronounced preference of Jesus for the way of Martha over that of Mary. Again to cite an Emersonian version: "Do not *say* things." For, "what you are stands over you and shouts so loud I cannot hear what you say to the contrary."

The Taoist ideal of mentality would seem to be not serenity but simple passivity. Whatever there is to be gained must be gained without trying. In Taoism is to be found an explanation for the saying of Jesus which has perplexed our Western minds: "The meek shall inherit the earth." A clear statement of this theme is to be found in the Book of Chuang-tzu, a fourth-century B.C. disciple of Lao-tzu, who wrote: "The perfect man employs his mind as a mirror. It grasps nothing; it refuses nothing. It receives, but does not keep."[18] Lao-tzu himself said, in verse 20, "Cut out cleverness and there are no anxieties." Rather, as he said in verse 19, "Cherish sincerity."

4.

Just what, then, did Lao-tzu and his followers conceive to be the solution for the tangled problems of living with oneself and with our fellows? Confucius, troubled by the inability of human beings to deal with the complexities of their own yearnings and the uncertainties of the socio-physical environment, advised that the best solution is to yield to the governance of a strict code of conventionality.[19] By this "tradition-directed"[20] orientation, everyone will know what to expect of himself and his fellows. The paths of duty and of social propriety will be clearly marked. In sharp contrast, the *Tao-Teh-Ching* avers in verse 25: "The principle of Tao is spontaneity." The New England Transcendentalists, praising individuality as against conformity, to this extent are followers of the *Tao*.[21]

---

[14] Will Durant, p. 652. Durant (on p. 653) notes the view of H. A. Giles that the *Tao-Teh-Ching* is a forgery, composed about 200 B.C., and the refutation of this view by James Legge. Such standard desk reference works as the *Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary* and *Webster's New World Dictionary* list Lao-tzu's dates as 604?-531 B.C.

[15] H. G. Creel, p. 84: "We shall drop the problem of the man, if there was such a man. . . . Instead, we shall consider the book."

[16] Will Durant, pp. 652-653.

[17] For further explanation of the significance of this threefold way, students are recommended to read, in order: Alan W. Watts, *The Way of Zen* (New York, 1957), chap. i; H. G. Creel, chap. vi; and F. S. C. Northrop, *The Meeting of East and West* (New York, 1946), chaps. ix and x, and particularly pp. 329-346.

[18] Cf. Charles Horton Cooley, *Human Nature and the Social Order* (New York, 1922).

So were they when they praised intuition and insight as against reason. To Lao-tzu, truth is never to be discovered by analysis—but always and forever by empathic feeling. According to Chuang-tzu, our personal and social problems arise primarily because "Men one and all value that part of knowledge which is known [or to be discovered]. They do not know how to avail themselves of the Unknown in order to reach knowledge. Is not this misguided?"[22] Lao-tzu similarly, in verse 19, advised: "Cut out sagacity; discard knowingness." In verse 21 he explains:

The Tao is something blurred and indistinct.
How blurred! How indistinct!
Yet within it are images.
How blurred! How indistinct!
Yet within it are things.
How dim! How confused!
Yet within it is mental power.
Because this power is most true,
Within it there is confidence.

These principles of spontaneity and intuition are but elaborations of the guideposts to the Way: "wu-wei" (passivity), "wu-hsin" (mindlessness), and "te" (spontaneous functioning). As in David Hume's skepticism, the essence of "knowledge" is seen as lying not in an objectified world of external reality but in the insight of the knower.[23] As in Hans Vaihinger, it is assumed that we live in a world not of "as is" but of "as if"—and that our subjective *interpretation* (individual or conventionalized) is the only reality of which we can be aware. Like Walter Lippmann's well-known formula for stereotyping, these Taoist principles also indicate that "For the most part [but without this timorous qualification] we do not first see and then define, we define first and then see."[24] Like Charles Keyser's interpretation of generalized utterances as "doctrinal functions,"[25] these principles assert that much of what we say is really a "mode of interpreting experience" rather than an objective description of reality.

Taoism is often cited as the leading opponent of Confucianism and indeed the *Tao* is the negation of formalistic conventionality. However, Lao-tzu did not interpret "unconventional" as meaning the flouting of convention. In ancient China as in our own contemporary world, the flat rejection of social values would have meant imprisonment, exile, excommunication, or death. Such flagrant negativism could never lead to

---

[19] As I tried to indicate in "The Confucian Rhetorical Tradition in Korea. . . ," *QJS,* XLV (December 1959), 363-373, and as I hope to make more explicit in a later study of the origins of Confucian rhetoric, this statement requires qualification. The Sage himself was enamoured of individuality, but he was keenly aware of its dangers and his followers exaggerated his precautionary safeguards.

[20] Cf. David Riesman, Nathan Glazer, and Reuel Denny, *The Lonely Crowd* (originally, Yale University Press, 1950, but I have used the Anchor edition, 1954), pp. 24-26.

[21] But insofar as the Transcendentalists emphasized buoyant self-expression, they were more American than Taoist. Cf. Vernon Louis Parrington, *Main Currents of American Thought,* II (New York, 1927), Part III, chap. i.

[22] Watts, p. 30.

[23] Cf. Angus Sinclair's interpretation of this skepticism in *The Conditions of Knowing* (New York, 1951), pp. 260 ff.

[24] Walter Lippmann, *Public Opinion* (New York, 1922), p. 81.

[25] C. J. Keyser, "The Nature of the Doctrinal Function and Its Role in Rational Thought," *Mathematics as Culture Clue and Other Essays* (New York, 1947), pp. 91-135.

"peace," the goal of the Way. What Lao-tzu meant by "unconventionality" is akin to the lessons we learn from anthropology, namely, to attain to an understanding of the artificial and diverse means by which the "social agglomerate" crystallizes, so that this awareness may serve as a protective shield to preserve us from the deadening effects of conformity.

Do not accord to social convention the inevitability of natural law, Lao-tzu pleaded. Understand that *custom* is neither more nor less than a social agreement which has attained currency because of its transient usefulness for maintaining the forms of established society (and bear in mind the "social lag" that occurs because conditions change more rapidly than do stereotyped conventions). Learn to see through appearances to the reality which is veiled by traditional modes of interpretation. It is only because of our human inability to live in immediate relationship to reality that it has proved necessary to invent such concepts as love, honor, charity, and the whole captivating mold we call "education."[26] Since our social codes are really a screen standing between us and reality, hypocrisy has become the ruling social virtue—a motivational pattern originating in pretense, designed to misdirect prying eyes of neighbors and always in disharmony with nature.[27]

Interpreted in this fashion, Taoism appears to have startling analogies with Freudian psychoanalysis. Despite the deep-seated conflict between Self and Society, Lao-tzu (like Freud) did not believe that peace is to be found through flouting social conventions. Neither would he countenance a hypocritical subservience to their dictates. There is a better way, he felt: a way of sufficient outward conformity to avoid social rejection while being simultaneously true to one's own inner vision of truth.

5.

The first requirement is to know what is true. This cannot be acomplished by reason or by analytical intelligence but by a non-mental, non-active cultivation of insight. "He also sees who only stands and waits." Alan Watts interprets the Taoist method as the utilization of "the peripheral vision of the mind." Like the Mahayana Buddhists, the Taoists believed that "no mind is the true mind."[28] Paradoxical as this may seem to our rationalist predilections, our own psychological concept of "subliminal inferences" concurs, at least to the extent of finding an additive value in non-rationality.[29]

In many aspects of living, we do best that to which we give least thought. Speech is itself an excellent illustration. If we tried to govern consciously the complex of muscles and nerves with which we speak, we never, for example, could utter such a phrase as "the Methodist Episcopal Church." We breathe and walk, both very complex activities, without thinking of the processes. We ride a bicycle well only after we stop thinking about how we do it. In whatever activity we become skilled, large and important portions of the act-complex become automatic. In other words, we attain to greater efficiency (even to greater mental efficiency) by withdrawing our minds from active supervision.

---

[26] Witter Bynner, *The Way of Life according to Lao-tzu* (New York, 1944), p. 35; and F. S. C. Northrop, pp. 330-346. For modern concern with this same problem, cf. the literature on General Semantics and (differently conceived) Benjamin Lee Whorf's explanation of the hampering effects of "linguistic determinism" (my phrase) in *Language, Thought, and Reality*, ed. John B. Carroll (New York, 1956).

[27] If this interpretation is correct, Lin Yutang's ascription of "the philosophy of camouflage" to Lao-tzu is fundamentally in error. True, Lao-tzu advocated "outward conformity"; but the pretense has been established by conventions, whereas Taoism is designed to help pierce through the exterior mask to the inner truth.

[28] Alan W. Watts, p. 36.

[29] Cf. Louis Cheskin, "Subliminal Research—Implications for Persuasion," *Today's Speech*, VII (April 1959) 19-21.

Similarly, we realize that non-awareness is often the chief characteristic of contentment. As Chuang-tzu says: "To be unaware of one's feet implies that the shoes are easy."[30] It is in this sense, according to the Taoists, that true peace comes from ceasing to strive, to criticize, to think. "Tao always does nothing and yet it achieves everything."[31] In the remarkably modern words of Yang Chu, from the *Lieh Tzu,* a fourth-century B.C. text of Taoism: "We waste ourselves in a mad scramble, seeking to snatch the hollow praise of an hour, scheming to contrive that somehow some remnant of reputation shall outlast our lives."[32] Our own Western paraphrase is the aphorism, "Happy is the country that has no history."

We half-know also that we may learn most truly that which we do not study. When we walk into a strange room, we may consciously notice a few large objects, but our peripheral vision takes in a wide range of unnoted items, and it is from this totality that our impression of the room takes form. We see a play and may like or dislike it; yet when we try to explain the nature of and the reasons for our reactions, our words sound hollow, artificial, and contrived in our own ears. We *know* that our reaction derives from far more and from far other reasons than those which our critical faculties can represent.

Intelligence, to the Taoist, does not consist of the analytic and associational activities of the cortex. It is, rather, the totality of the "feeling tone" which emanates from a multiplicity of factors too vast and amorphous to be identified. The *Tao* is "blurred and indistinct. . . . Yet within it are images." The way to see, to comprehend, these images is not by trying to understand them, not by searching for them, but by waiting quiescently for the sense of their presence to emerge. To repeat what we have earlier cited from Chuang-tzu, the mind should behave like a mirror: neither seeking nor rejecting, merely reflecting. Above all, thinking should not be purposive; to think purposively requires a sharpening of focus and a delimiting of the field of observation that shut out or diminish everything except the preconceived definition of the situation.

Analytic intelligence always misrepresents—never can possibly discover or define reality—for truth is an inner essence with such multiple manifestations that any one formulation of it must deny or ignore much of its meaning. Ralph Waldo Emerson well phrased this insight of the Taoists in his famous lyric, "Brahma," which begins:

If the red slayer thinks he slays
Or if the slain think he is slain,
They know not well the subtle ways
I keep, and pass, and turn again.

To know, then, requires not the "use" of mind but the permissive functioning which can only occur without conscious direction. This freeing of the mind to utilize its own resourcefulness is far different from not thinking at all; it consists not of purposive control but of the disciplined abandonment of controls over the senses, nerves, and muscles, to the end that they may "vacuously" pursue their own apparently randomized but natural investigations of nature. Rather than stressing the planned exploration of self or of the environment, Taoism presumes and encourages a spontaneous functioning of the totality of all parts of the receptive mechanisms, including memory.

---

[30] Cited by Watts, p. 38.
[31] Mary L. Nourse, p. 63.
[32] Cited by Creel, pp. 82-83.

It is important that we avoid making the "logical leap" of assuming that what Lāo-tzu meant was that we should disassociate ourselves from external reality through a denial of the primacy of sense-data, in order that we might instead seek insight from spiritual or supernatural sources. Quite the contrary, as Northrop properly insisted, the Taoists are "more thoroughgoing empiricists" than even such a determined Western empiricist as David Hume.[33] So much do they value the data of the "real world" that they seek to divest themselves of all preconceptions and of all the limitations arising from focused attention. Reality cannot be immediately sensed, for it is real only as an inseparable portion of an indeterminate and indefinite continuum. When an Oriental "loses face," it is because he has committed himself to some determinate act which he proves unable to perform; his shame arises from the fact that in so committing himself he has denied the essential wisdom that any commitment to a particularized and determinate act is a rejection of the fundamental reality of the indeterminate space-time continuum. Far wiser would it have been to have faced the initial situation with the Cantonese disclaimer of certainty, *Wock-jeh*—"perhaps."[34]

6.

What, now, has this to do with rhetoric?

In the first place, the *Tao* is not, as superficially appears, a rejection of rhetoric. Lao-tzu not only understood that speech is one of the social necessities, but he required that it be "good." In verse 27 of the *Tao-Teh-Ching* he declares, "Just as a good runner leaves no tracks, so does a good speaker make no blunders." In verse 8 he established the criterion that "A good speech is judged by its truthfulness." When, in verse 45, he said that "the greatest eloquence is like stuttering," he must have meant that what is required is a new conception of eloquence based upon the expectations of its listeners. He indicated that the end of rhetoric is peace when he said, in verse 81, that "It is not good to settle a grievance if the settlement leads to other grievances."

The motivational philosophy of Taoism clearly was based upon *identification*. This emerges from the whole scheme of Taoist thought and is rendered explicit by Chuang-tzu:

> Concerning the right and the wrong, the "thus" and the "not thus," if the right is indeed right, there is no point in arguing about the fact that it is different from the wrong; if the "thus" is indeed "thus," why dispute about the way in which it is different from the "not thus"? Regardless of whether the various arguments actually meet one another or not, let us harmonize them within the all-embracing universe, and let them run their course.[35]

Much of the fault in our discourse, according to Taoism, derives from trying too hard. "He who raises himself on tiptoe cannot long remain steady," we are told in verse 24 of the *Tao-Teh-Ching*. In verse 46 we are told that "There is no greater misfortune than not to know when one has enough." And in verse 9 Lao-tzu says:

> If you would not spill the wine,
> Do not fill the glass too full.
> If you wish your blade to hold its edge,
> Do not try to make it over-keen. . . .
> When you have done your work and established
> your fame, withdraw!
> Such is the Way of Heaven.

---

[33] Northrop, p. 332.

[34] *Ibid.*, p. 334. For Northrop's explanation of what is here summarized in a paragraph, cf. chaps. ix and x, and particularly pp. 322-346.

[35] Cited by Creel, p. 89. Cf. Oliver, *Psychology of Persuasive Speech,* chap. viii, "Identification."

In sum, Taoism has much to say concerning *inventio,* with the what and the how of gathering matter for speech. Secondly, it has a great deal to do with *dispositio,* with the selecting, the arranging, and the assigning of relative importance to the parts of the matter assembled. Thirdly, it has sharp bearing upon audience adaptation and the selection of motivational appeals, urging that we "adapt" to the universal, never to the particular, and that we appeal not to what is believed but to what is totally sensed and felt. Fourthly, it has strong implications for *elocutio,* or style, and *pronunciato,* or delivery, advising that our speech be non-assertive and non-argumentative, rather than being prescriptive or categorical. Finally, it demonstrates that Lao-tzu was above all a rhetorician, in that he stressed strongly the factor of the flow and ebb of influence in human affairs.

Taoist-like, I shall attempt no further analysis of the bearing of Taoism upon the various elements of rhetoric, but shall leave it to the reader to deduce such relationships as his temperament permits him to perceive. For whereas our rhetoric is elementalistic, Taoism insists upon the interpenetration of the whole into every part. Moreover, I must not risk Lao-tzu's denunciation for not knowing when enough has been said. The nub of the matter is that teaching by implication was the only rhetoric which Lao-tzu would abide.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND MAJORITY RULE IN THE TALMUD

Gerald M. Phillips

IN a previous article in *QJS*, "The Place of Rhetoric in the Babylonian Talmud" (December, 1957), I reviewed the general Talmudic rhetorical implications. Although there is "no specific mention of rhetoric in the Talmud," it was pointed out, and it is not probable the rabbis knew of rhetoric in other cultures, "the whole Jewish culture of the Talmudic period rested upon the art of rhetoric in use." That rhetoric is not mentioned as such is not significant, however, since discussion at the Talmudic Academies came primarily from religious matters; there is no mention of astronomy, geometry, history, or any other subject. In this paper, attention is given to two specific rhetorical matters in the Talmud, freedom of speech and majority rule.

The Talmud is, of course, the written record of numerous discussions conducted by the rabbis at the Academies of Babylon and Palestine. The Talmudic Academies trace their origins back before the time of Ezra, but their real importance in Judaism began with the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem in 70 A.D. In this period the Jewish people became preoccupied with religious education. There is evidence of almost universal literacy among the Jews of Palestine and Babylon at this time. The leaders of the Jewish community derived sanction for their emphasis on education from the Bible, and rather than concentrate on metaphysical questions, turned their attention to ethical matters in the form of *halachah*, a word derived from the Hebrew root *holach*, meaning "to go," and which can be freely defined as "a way to go." Discovery of *halachah* was synonymous with the discovery of what God wanted men to do. The primary function of the Talmudic Academies was to discover *halachah* for all of life's problems and to expound it to the community.

The search for *halachah* was done in a democratic fashion. There was no barrier, save that of intelligence, to participation in the fellowship of the Academies. Any youth could become a scholar through diligent study, and any scholar had the right to speak out on matter of *halachah*. The processes of discussion and debate were freely used. The equality of the scholars brought about a doctrine of free speech, and free disputation necessitated the discovery of a means to resolve conflict.

Because the Jewish religion demanded that a *halachah* be found for every act of life, the post-Biblical Jewish community evolved into a semi-theocratic, semi-democratic state. The Jews in Babylon were granted considerable autonomy, and the dominant role in the local government of the Jewish community was played by the Academies. The Academies were loosely organized bodies of scholars whose function was to impart knowledge to all comers. Most of the academicians also had some other trade. The Academies had no curriculum and

Mr. Phillips is Assistant Professor of Speech, Washington State University. He is director of the local Hebrew school.

no formal organization other than the appointment of one distinguished scholar to preside over the discussions.

The Academies served as judicial bodies in all disputes involving Jews. They also established religious policies for the community and were consulted on matters of daily behavior. Semi-annually the whole Jewish population would be summoned to one of the two leading Academies, either at Sura or Pumbeditha, to hear the rabbis expound the law in public lectures. These assemblies were referred to as *kalloth*[1] and there the population could discuss and question any decisions handed down by the rabbis. Discussion and disputation were always related to the Torah.[2]

Disputations and speeches at the Academies were theoretically free from any interference, divine or human. An important Talmudic passage indicates the rabbis felt not even God could interfere in their discussions, and they set down the dictum that human reason has greater probitive force than miracles. God, they said, agreed with this when he revealed His "whole law" on Mount Sinai.[3] A Biblical passage, "after the majority must one incline,"[4] was cited to prove their case further. The rabbis felt that all God's law had been revealed to Moses. Human fallibility may have resulted in the loss of much of it, but a perfect God could make only a perfect revelation. Hence, when the rabbis sought *halachah,* they sought the original word of God which has been revealed but lost. God, they felt, endowed man with the intellect to discover His will, and hence, majority rule exercised through the intellect of men was the accepted method of discovering Truth. The rabbis did not expect a miracle to solve their problems. It should be noted that this exalted idea of the supremacy of man's intellect began to emerge as early as 175 B.C.

Freedom of speech pervaded all phases of Academic activity. Any statement made was subject to question and disputation by any member of the Academy. Though many speakers objected to having their speeches interrupted, their imprecations could not stop the heckling, and it became a fixed principle that free and open debate was mandatory on all issues.[5] So important was open debate that students were often assigned to prepare a set of questions and arguments in case there was not sufficient spontaneous controversy. Frequently lecturers who were merely describing past decisions would be called upon to defend the decisions, and the result often was a reversal of the past *halachah.* Students were admonished that their duty was "to ask" for only in this way could *halachah* be determined. A historian of the Jews, Heinrich Graetz, says "Freedom of speech became so firmly established a right that no one could be attacked for expressing opinions unless he controverted any received dogma or rejected the concept of the Divinity peculiar to Judaism."[6] One of the leading scholars, head of one of the most influential Academies, was deposed because the associates of his Academy felt he opposed free speech. The great Rabban Gamaliel had issued an edict as to the date of the beginning of the Day of Atonement. R. Joshua disagreed about the date and Gamaliel demanded that Joshua appear with his lunch on the day that Joshua held was the Day of Atonement.[7] He made his appearance but Gamaliel's students objected to what they felt had been an intolerable insult inflicted on Joshua by Gamaliel. Gamaliel, they claimed, did not show sufficient respect for the opinions of another scholar. They voted him out of office and, to add to the insult, they elected as their head an eighteen-year-old member Eleazar b. Azariah.[8] This story was used to illustrate to students that they were obligated to respect the opinions of others and to avoid excessive dogmatism.[9]

---

[1] *Kalloth* is the plural form. The singular is *kallah.*

[2] Torah refers to the first five books of the Bible, which represent the core of Jewish law. Torah also refers to the totality of Jewish religious law.

[3] Baba Mezi'a 59b, 352-356. References to Talmudic tractates in this paper are to the English translation published by Soncino Press: I. Epstein, *The Babylonian Talmud,* 35 vols. (London, 1936-52). The first reference is to the standard folio in the Hebrew-Aramaic editions, all of which carry standard pagination. The second number refers to the page in the Soncino edition.

[4] Exodus 23:2.

[5] Mo'ed Katan 5a, 24.

[6] Heinrich Graetz, *History of the Jews* (Philadelphia, 1891), II, 162.

Very few absolute decisions were ever reached at the Academies. Virtually every statement of *halachah* recorded in the Talmud has a minority opinion appended to it, and unless a matter were one of extremely high religious observance, the minority was free to follow its own particular view.[10] In many cases agreement could not be reached at all; each individual was then free to do as he chose.[11] Minority views were recorded in the Talmud because the rabbis held that man was fallible, and later generations might decide that the minority view was actually the correct one and reverse the decision.[12] Hence, all decisions were reversible. It must be remembered, however, that respect for tradition and rabbinic authority was very strong, and individuals rarely differed from a majority view.

A pervasive doctrine of free speech demands that some method of resolution of conflict be discovered. Majority rule was most widely used. The rabbis attributed great antiquity to the practice of using a vote to resolve conflicts. They traced it back to the words "follow the majority" used in Exodus 23:2.[13] One lecturer says that Moses' followers voted to see what Moses would have done if he were still alive. The use of a vote was held to be proper procedure in "difficult matters."[14] The ancient Sanhedrin used majority vote to resolve all issues, with the restriction that if a vote was unanimous for conviction, the accused must be released since a unanimous vote would indicate collusion.[15]

The procedure used in voting in the Academies was formal: The head of the Academy placed a sword in the ground at the door and announced, "He who would enter, let him enter, but he who would depart, let him not depart."[16] All members of an Academy were obligated to vote on every issue that arose while they were present. Voting was by roll call, with the head arranging the order so that younger members of the Academy could not follow their elders.[17]

A majority was sufficient to determine *halachah,* following the dictum laid down by Akiba who said, "where an individual joins issue with the majority, the *halachah* is determined by the majority."[18] Most of the rabbis agreed that voting took precedence over any other form of resolution of conflict, with the possible exception of the presentation of incontrovertible fact. However, even when factual evidence was presented, a vote was often held to see whether it was indeed "incontrovertible."[19]

---

[7] The Day of Atonement, *Yom Kippur,* is a solemn fast day. The start of the holidays was determined by intercalation of a lunar calendar, and hence there was considerable room for disagreement on starting days. Gamaliel's edict was an insufferable insult. Joshua is frequently mentioned as a man of great patience and courtesy since he complied with the edict.

[8] Berakoth 27b, 166.

[9] Megillah 32a, 194.

[10] Yebamoth 40a, 258.

[11] Gittin 60b, 285.

[12] Edduyoth I,5.

[13] Hullin 11a, 47.

[14] Temurah 15b, 107.

[15] Sanhedrin 88b, 585.

[16] Shabbath 17a, 70.

[17] *Ibid.,* 36a, 226.

[18] Berakoth 37a, 233.

Some authorities placed restrictions on the use of majority rule. One authority held that majority rule could only be used when the opposing parties to a dispute were equal in intellect. He held that the opinion of a great sage could have more probitive value than the opinions of all his students combined.[20] For this reason, an individual who held himself to be a follower of a great sage was obligated to adhere to all of his decisions—he was not permitted to select some views from one sage and some from another.[21]

Because of the ingrained nature of the doctrine of free speech, however, any individual was free to contradict and act against majority rule so long as he was motivated by deep moral conviction and not by obstructionism.[22] It was inconceivable to the rabbis that any of them might be infallible, so they obligated themselves to allow all views to be heard, since all views had an equal potential of being truth and should be allowed to serve as guides to later generations.[23]

There was considerable disagreement about the role of evidence in the settlement of arguments. One sage stated, "where it is possible to ascertain the facts we do so, and only where it is impossible to ascertain the facts does one follow the majority."[24] The rabbis applied this to acceptance of *halachah* in a very practical way, for they agreed that if it was impossible (not to be confused with unpleasant) for an individual to follow a ruling of the Academy, he was exempt, and if a community found it impossible, the community was exempt.[25] Observation was considered important; the rabbis agreed that such things as the rising of the sun or the setting of the moon could be settled only by observation.[26] Adherents of strict majority rule, however, asserted that facts must pass through the test of credibility by majority opinion. One authority cited a caution against hasty judgment: "Perhaps ye saw a man running after his fellow into a ruin. Ye pursued him and found him, sword in hand with blood dripping from it, while the murdered man writhed in agony; if this is what ye saw, ye saw nothing."[27] They held that all avenues of probability must be explored and all submitted to vote before acting on circumstantial evidence of this sort.

Once a ruling had been passed by majority vote, it required another majority vote to reverse it, and it was held that the body that overruled a *halachah* must be equal in wisdom and in numbers to the body that passed it.[28] This occasioned some interesting discussions as to the meaning of the word "equal."

Some conflicts were left unresolved. Sometimes a majority could not be garnered to support one point of view, and sometimes facts seemed to clash. Sometimes feelings were too strong to bring the matter to a vote. When this happened, it was generally agreed that the question could stand without a solution and each person be allowed to evolve his own idea.[29] The rabbinic legend held that Elijah the Prophet would come at the end of time to resolve all these unsettled conflicts, but actually, many unresolved issues were settled at a later date when tempers had cooled, more facts were available, or different personnel voted.[30]

---

[19] Baba Bathra 23b, 117; Kethuboth 21a, 116; Bezah 11a, 53; Bekoroth 37a, 236.
[20] Yebamoth 14a, 72.
[21] Rosh Hashanah 14a, 52.
[22] Gittin 41a, 175.
[23] Edduyoth I, 5.
[24] Hullin 11b, 52.
[25] Abodah Zarah 36a, 175.
[26] Aboth IV, 8.
[27] Sanhedrin 40a, 255.
[28] Sanhedrin 59a, 402; Edduyoth I, 6.
[29] Baba Bathra 52a, 214.

It should be noted that free speech at the Academies was limited by the nature of the "curriculum." The Jewish religion was the core—and instruction took the form of exhaustive exegeses of Scripture in order to discover *halachah*.[31] A passage from the Talmud, footnoted in the Soncino edition, explains the content of the curriculum:

> . . . Scriptures, Mishnah, Gemara, Halachoth, Aggadoth; and the subtle points of the Torah (referring to quasi-Mishnaic works) and the minutiae of the Scribes (correct reading of non-vowel texts); the inferences from minor to major and the verbal analogies (the hermeneutics of interpretation); astronomy (to intercalate the lunar year) and geometry (to determine the limits to which you might walk on the Sabbath); washers' proverbs and fox fables (homiletics through parables); the language of the demons, the whisper of the palms, the language of the ministering angels (mystic works) and the great matter (the mysterious references in Daniel and Ezekiel) and the small matter (understanding the details of disputation).[32]

Subjects such as history, literature, and art entered the curriculum only as they related to some religious matter. There was a great deal of teaching of science and medicine. The rabbis were concerned with the human body and its functions for religious reasons, and from this a great medical lore grew. Many of the rabbis were doctors by trade, and the Academy often served as a medical center for the community. The study of knowledge from other cultures was strictly forbidden, except to the heads of the Academies, and those who would study "Greek Wisdom" were cast out from the Academy. Freedom of discussion prevailed only on those matters which were not forbidden: matters which were considered legitimate for the members of the Academy to study at length.

The Talmudic speaking situation emerges with a mature view of the worth of each man's opinion. The practical desire to get things done led to the adoption of majority rule but so strong was the feeling for the dignity of the individual man that majority rule was subjected to many restrictions, and actually, each man was free to speak and act as he would so long as he did not deny the existence of God or jeopardize the rights of other citizens of the community.

---

[30] Berakoth 35b, 222.

[31] George Foot Moore, *Judaism* (Cambridge, Mass., 1944), I, 319.

[32] Baba Bathra 134a, 563.

ELIZABETHAN STAGES AND OPEN-AIR PERFORMANCES IN AMERICA A HALF CENTURY AGO

Wendell Cole

THE audience which attends Shakespearean festivals such as those given each summer at Ashland, San Diego, or the two American Stratfords, is not at all astonished to find the plays being performed on some modification of the Elizabethan stage, nor are spectators at Ashland surprised to find themselves sitting outdoors to watch Shakespeare. Probably most of these playgoers are under the impression, if they have thought about it at all, that public acceptance of the architectural platform as a stage on which to produce Elizabethan or Greek dramas has developed only during the past twenty-five years. As early as the first decade of this century, however, Elizabethan stages and open-air performances were controversial issues discussed frequently in magazine and newspaper articles, and it is necessary to go back sixty-five years for the first American attempt at reproducing a Shakespearean stage.

It had doubtless never occurred to the ordinary American playgoer of 1900 that Shakespeare might be produced on anything but a proscenium stage, or if he had read reports of productions by William Poel and the Elizabethan Stage Society, he dismissed them as experiments by some strange English intellectuals. Nevertheless, during the first fifteen years of the present century, besides the large number of magazine and newspaper articles discussing "the right way to produce Shakespeare," numerous enthusiastic professors and actors lectured on the advantages of platform stages and open-air theatres, and what is most important, hundreds of amateur and semi-professional performances were given on replicas of Greek stages, Shakespearean platforms, and in "nature" theatres. Since there was much talk in the nineties among various scholars and theatre artists about taking "theatre" away from the commercial managers and restoring it to the "people" who had created it originally, it was not surprising that after 1900 this folk movement in the theatre was expressed through historical pageants written by non-professionals and produced in open-air settings. The open-air historical pageant was revived during the thirties by Paul Green and has since flourished successfully at Manteo, Williamsburg, Cherokee, and elsewhere. In this paper is considered only the production of plays, both in-doors and out-doors, in earlier years at the beginning of this century.

The Broadway professional theatre, in spite of all the amateur dramatic activity after 1900, paid little attention to platform staging for a decade and went right on producing Shakespeare's plays on picture frame stages using late Victorian scenic methods. Indeed, for more than half of the twentieth century it has been the American colleges, community theatres, and semi-professional

Mr. Cole is Associate Professor of Speech and Drama, Stanford University.

acting groups which have taken the lead in encouraging the presentation of Shakespeare and the classics on stages which are believed to be similar to those of the original productions. By 1900 this interest among American amateur theatrical groups in "reforming" late nineteenth-century methods of staging the classic play could be observed in two movements. One was directed towards replacing the elaborate wings and drops of the proscenium stage with a three dimensional setting of platforms and curtains suggested by Elizabethan practices, and providing some of the playing areas available in Shakespeare's theatre.[1] The second movement, which also influenced modern production methods, was concerned with the promotion of open-air performances. Advocates of outdoor theatre proclaimed that open-air drama was the cure for all of the ills of the commercial theatre[2] in much the same way that some of the adherents of central staging have felt that the arena is the solution for all of our present-day theatre problems. It was evident by the opening years of the new century that these two movements under way in the American amateur theatre were preparing audiences to accept the platform stage for classic plays.

Both of these movements apparently developed out of the research into historical staging methods which had become popular in the professional theatre during the second half of the nineteenth century. Instead of building replicas of Shakespearean playhouses, the "antiquarian" professional actor-managers such as Charles Kean, Henry Irving, and the American, Augustin Daly, endeavored to construct authentic "period" settings within the Victorian picture frame proscenium. Painted wings and drops with some built pieces were used to create what was considered the ultimate in historic "realism." At the turn of the century it was Irving's Shakespearean productions which set the fashion in both England and the United States. "In our model Shakespeare revivals," wrote the critic Fitzgerald, recalling Irving's beautifully painted scenery for *Macbeth,* "painted cloths" would be "the only scenery used."[3] "Irving had learned his stage scenery lesson from the first innovator in the realm of historical accuracy, Charles Kean," and he "demanded that authority be given for every costume, weapon, piece of furniture, and every nail, blade, and button uesd," asserted Montrose J. Moses.[4] In 1908, the American scene painter Homer Emens maintained that "nothing today surpasses the stage effects brought over by Sir Henry Irving on his first visit here."[5] Since Irving was the "acknowledged leader of the English speaking stage artistically,"[6] it was his productions which provided the scenic ideal for American managers in the nineties and the early decades of the new century. The initial American attempt to reproduce an Elizabethan stage seems to have been in 1895, but even fifteen years later, excessively elaborate wing and drop settings were still customary for Broadway Shakespearean productions.

---

[1] The nineties was a period of dispute among scholars concerning Shakespearean staging methods occasioned by the discovery in 1888 in the Utrecht University Library of the de Witt drawing of the Swan Theatre.

[2] Lucy France Pierce, "Secessionists in the Arena," *Drama,* III (August 1913), 131.

[3] Percy Fitzgerald, "Shakespearean Representations, Their Laws and Limits," *Gentleman's Magazine,* CCXCIV (April 1903), 323.

[4] Montrose J. Moses, "The Birth of a New Art," *McClure's Magazine,* LII (October 1920), 36.

[5] Quoted in Mary Gay Humphreys, "Stage Scenery and the Men Who Paint It," *Theatre Magazine,* VIII (August 1908), 203. Irving first appeared in New York, October 29, 1883.

[6] Lawrence Gilman, "Sir Henry Irving and His Career," *Harper's Weekly,* XLIX (October 28, 1905), 1557.

As late as 1911 the famous English actress Ellen Terry declared, "As a rule I am in favor of everything possible being painted. I like an out-of-door scene, or a palace with wings—yes, with wings! For there are emotions that cannot be realized in a room at all."[7] Miss Terry, of course, was the co-star in many of the Irving productions.

The other English actor-manager whose Shakespearean productions were being imitated by Broadway managers was Sir Herbert Beerbohm Tree. By 1916, however, when Tree's *Henry VIII* was being shown for the first time in New York, there was much dissatisfaction with his methods. As *The Nation* had remarked earlier about this production, "audiences are paying attention not to Shakespeare but to the magnificence and educational influence of the pageant."[8] The productions of the American actor-managers approached these English importations in their lavish use of painted scenery, but the "Royal Academy picture scenes" of Irving and Tree were "copied and often murdered through slovenliness by Richard Mansfield, Forbes-Robertson, and Marlowe and Sothern."[9] Because of the difficulties in shifting the historically "accurate" settings, the opening night performance of *Antony and Cleopatra,* in which Sothern and Marlowe were starred at the New Theatre in 1909, ran until almost one o'clock.[10] When Sothern and Marlowe appeared in *Macbeth* in 1910, *Theatre Magazine* observed, "From the standpoint of mise-en-scène there is only praise to be recorded," and added that there were "no crude anachronisms" in the scenery, but by the next year Walter P. Eaton was protesting that "Sothern and Marlowe with their elaborate scenery clog their productions and either slaughter the text or keep their audiences in the theatre until midnight."[11]

This growing dissatisfaction, beginning in the nineties with the over-decorated "antiquarian" scenery and the indiscriminate cutting and rearranging of Shakespeare's texts made necessary by scene shifting difficulties, was one of the factors influencing the many amateur efforts made after 1900 to recreate the Elizabethan platform stage. Another factor behind college productions was the desire to study the technical problems of the plays themselves by reproducing the conditions of their original performances. It was this possibility of seeing an Elizabethan play performed on a structure approximating an Elizabethan stage which prompted George Pierce Baker and George Lyman Kittredge to have the first Elizabethan platform stage in America constructed in Sanders Theatre at Harvard in 1895. The design of this stage was based on the recently published drawing of the Swan Theatre and on Henslowe's Fortune contract. The play performed at this time was Jonson's *Epicoene,* given by a visiting group of students from the American Academy of Dramatic Arts.[12] This first introduction of the Elizabethan platform stage attracted attention from schools and colleges all over the United States and was to inspire similar efforts in the new century.

---

[7] Ellen Terry, "Some Ideas on Stage Decoration," *McClure's Magazine,* XXXVI (January 1911), 291.

[8] "Scenery and Drama," *The Nation,* XCII (March 23, 1911), 300.

[9] Moses, p. 35.

[10] John Corbin, "Shakespeare his Own Stage Manager," *Century Magazine,* LXXXIII (December 1911), 270.

[11] *Theatre Magazine,* XII (December 1910), 161. Walter P. Eaton, "The Theatre: The Question of Scenery," *American Magazine,* LXXII (July 1911), 377.

[12] George Pierce Baker, "The Revival of Ben Jonson's *Epicoene; Or the Silent Woman,* March 20, 1895," *Harvard Graduates' Magazine,* III (June 1895), 495. A New York performance by these students also was acted in a very simplified, single setting but on a proscenium stage. Costumed students in boxes and the pit represented Elizabethan spectators.

During the next few years after the production of *Epicoene* in 1895, there was a series of Elizabethan revivals at Harvard by the Delta Upsilon fraternity, but it was not until 1904 that another Elizabethan stage was constructed in Sanders Theatre. The closest to New York a replica of the Elizabethan theatre came was in a production by the Yale Dramatic Association of Thomas Heywood's *The Fair Maid of the West* in June, 1901, at the Hyperion Theatre in New Haven. The scenery, "borrowed from Harvard College," and presumably the set used for *Epicoene,* represented the Swan Theatre in 1596. A photograph in *Werner's Magazine* shows painted flats in a "rough barn-like structure." The performance "began with the raising of a red flag to the top of the building and the entrance of the crowd into the pit."[13]

The next university performance using an Elizabethan stage seems to have been at Stanford on the West Coast, but before that noteworthy occasion, there were at least two semi-professional productions in New York with simplified architectural settings. In October, 1902, a group calling itself the Elizabethan Stage Society of London produced *Everyman* under the direction of Ben Greet. New York audiences saw an architectural setting not in the form of an Elizabethan stage, but suggesting in a simplified way the apse of a Romanesque cathedral. A forestage with steps into the orchestra recalled both Greek and Elizabethan theatres. Details of the set were all painted rather than three dimensional.[14]

The following year, 1903, *Romeo and Juliet* was produced at Mrs. Osborn's Playhouse in New York by Frank Lea Short, with the stage and its surroundings, *Harper's Weekly* reported, "a reproduction of the theatre as it was known in Shakespeare's time." "Beneath a primitive balcony were two doors that opened inward. A green baize curtain worked on old-fashioned rings divided the back of the stage from the front. . . . Sitting in boxes and in the front row of the orchestra stalls were actors impersonating theatre-goers of Shakespeare's day." "A doddering old man" changed the placards on the stage after each scene. "The real step forward," continued *Harper's Weekly,* "is in the accuracy of the setting which is based upon the old printed reproduction of the Swan Theatre."[15]

In the autumn of 1902, Raymond Macdonald Alden, who had been a student of George Pierce Baker at Harvard, wrote to Baker from Stanford University for information on Harvard's Elizabethan stage. Stanford, it appeared, was planning to erect the first Elizabethan stage on the West Coast for a production of Beaumont and Fletcher's *The Knight of the Burning Pestle.* The design of the Stanford stage, like the one at Harvard, was based on the de Witt drawing of the Swan. This production was so successful when it was given in the Stanford Assembly Hall in March, 1903, that it was repeated that same month in the gymnasium at the University of California.[16] This setting was used again in September, 1903, by the Ben Greet Company for their performance at Stanford of *Twelfth Night* and in October, 1904, for Greet's productions of *Hamlet* and *Much Ado About Nothing.* In a magazine article in 1905, Greet used a photograph of this setting in a scene from *Hamlet* "as given by my company in its entirety at the Leland Stanford University, and which represents my ideas as to the proper method of staging the plays, though I do not think anything is gained by representing an Elizabethan audience seated at the play."[17] In April, 1905, the Stanford English Club produced Jonson's *Every Man in His Humor* in this same setting. These first amateur or semi-professional efforts not only had little influence upon the American professional theatre, but eventually such methods of production caused active opposition from professional actors and critics. Although as early as 1898 Brander Matthews at Columbia was claiming that "We are perfectly willing to do without [scenery and costumes] if only we are warned before hand,"[18] the New York managers were evidently more inclined to agree with W. J. Lawrence's statement that "Ever since the days of Charles Kean, Shakespeare has been kept alive on Metropolitan boards largely by dint of lavish mounting."[19] Lawrence, who opposed the use of the Elizabethan stage in a number of articles, referred to the "feeble" efforts of the "rabble army of faddists known as the Elizabethan Stage Society." Tree objected to "any return to a primitive treatment of scenery,"[20] and the scholarly English critic William Archer, after he had seen the Elizabethan Stage Society performances in England in 1896, declared, "Once for all, we cannot return to the arras and rushes of Elizabeth."[21]

---

[13] "An Elizabethan Play at Yale," *Werner's Magazine,* XXVII (June 1901), 267.

[14] Photograph, *Theatre Magazine,* II (December 1902), 31.

[15] "An Experiment in Drama," *Harper's Weekly,* XLVII (February 21, 1903), 325. Mrs. Osborn and her company would be considered at the present time a kind of Off-Broadway semi-professional group.

[16] The reviewer for the San Francisco *Call* made an interesting comment on the platform stage in the Stanford production. "Singularly like the conditions existing on the Chinese stage—as locally to be observed—were the conditions of the Elizabethan drama." *Call,* March 8, 1903, Sec. II, 3.

For several years in this period, the chief exponent of Elizabethan staging in America was Ben Greet, who by 1905 was claiming to have "acted at every leading university and college in this country."[22] His company was composed largely of young English actors, with smaller roles often played by students from the college at which the company was performing.[23] In May, 1903, he presented an open-air performance of *As You Like It* with Edith Wynne Matthison at South Field on the campus of Columbia University. According to *Theatre Magazine,* the stage was "a verdurous, rustling glade with banked dogwood blossoms for footlights."[24] In February, 1904, Greet staged *Twelfth Night* at the Knickerbocker Theatre in New York in "only one setting, the scene representing a large room scantily furnished and with a curtained center back." A photograph shows this to have been an accurate description.[25] *Theatre Magazine* found this method "a dreary, monotonous and tedious system of theatrical procedure. With no change of scenery to mark the geographical differences, there is . . . a constant tax on the mind to differentiate the sea coast of Illyria from the scene in the palace. . . . When the stage set is limited to a few stiff straight backed chairs, it robs the picture of graceful pose and harmonious groupings."

---

[17] Ben Greet, "Shakespeare and the Modern Theatre," *Harper's Weekly,* XLIX (November 4, 1905), 1604.

[18] Brander Matthews, "Conventions of the Drama," *Scribner's Magazine,* XXIII (April 1898), 502.

[19] William J. Lawrence, "Scenery on Tour," *Magazine of Art,* XIX (November 1896), 477.

[20] H. Beerbohm Tree, "The Staging of Shakespeare," *Living Age,* VIII (August 11, 1900), 355.

[21] William Archer, "The Limitations of Scenery," *Magazine of Art,* XIX (October 1896), 434. Archer saw *Measure for Measure, The Comedy of Errors,* and *Doctor Faustus* in Elizabethan settings. While the views of Lawrence and Archer were similar to those of the commercial managers, George Bernard Shaw expressed the opposite opinion. Reviewing *Doctor Faustus* "on a stage after the model of the Fortune Playhouse" he wrote, "The more I see of these performances by the Elizabethan Stage Society, the more I am convinced that their method of presenting an Elizabethan play is not only the right method for that particular sort of play but that any play performed on a platform amidst the audience gets closer home to its hearers than when it is presented as a picture framed by a proscenium." Bernard Shaw, *Our Theatres in the Nineties,* I (London, 1948), 184.

[22] Greet, *loc. cit.*

[23] Sixteen minor speaking roles in *Hamlet* and numerous "supers" were played by Stanford students during Greet's visit in 1904. *The Daily Palo Alto,* November 4, 1904, p. 1.

[24] *Theatre Magazine,* III (June 1903), 325.

In 1905 Greet was again back in New York with a production of *Hamlet.* At this time he was not attempting a replica of the Shakespearean stage. "The insistence upon the scenic element in Shakespeare is superfluous," he wrote. "I lay all possible emphasis upon a faithful and effective rendering of the text. I rather desire to avoid the semblance of a Swan Theatre, a Fortune, or a Globe. I would rather imagine the play as being given in one of the college halls, . . . or better still, Lincoln's Inn or the Middle Temple. I have purposely designed my stage that I may represent the plays without the distractions and inconvenience of a Sixteenth Century Playhouse."[26] "Ben Greet is obstinately convinced that Shakespeare was without not only pictorial scenery, but scenic properties," remarked John Corbin.[27] These productions by Greet, although their influence on the professional theatre is difficult to point out, were most important in stimulating amateur groups to produce Shakespeare in simplified architectural settings. This "initial impulse" of Greet "encouraged colleges to amateur endeavor; it made possible the Coburn Players; it suggested festivals to small communities and to social groups in crowded quarters of our cities."[28]

An Elizabethan playhouse was again erected at Harvard in 1904 when Forbes-Robertson was invited to appear there in *Hamlet.* Under the direction of George Pierce Baker, the old setting built in 1895 was redesigned by the chairman of the Department of Architecture, H. Langford Warren. This production included "a rush strewn pit filled with Elizabethan spectators."[29] Baker found the set most useful in studying the technical problems of staging Shakespeare. "An intelligent approximation . . . to the Swan Theatre as it looked in February, 1601, when *Twelfth Night* is supposed to have been first acted" was erected at both Harvard and Yale in 1908 for Maude Adams' production.[30] Every detail of the setting "had been approved by the scholars of the English department. . . . To the stage a roof was added, and to further suggest the idea of an auditorium open to the heavens, canvas to represent sky and clouds was stretched around the upper walls. . . . What stage setting there was, lads in long blue coats bore on and off through the curtained doors."[31] Walter P. Eaton found this production "among the most successful attempts at Shakespearean staging."[32]

At the close of the first decade of the twentieth century the "obstinate" Mr. Greet was still using simplified architectural settings. When in the spring of 1910 he staged *Dr. Faustus* at the Garden Theatre in New York "with such settings as were in vogue at the beginning of the seventeenth century, the rendering took on the quaint atmospheric condition so necessary to the proper expression of a poem."[33] That same spring the New Theatre, which had been built at great cost for "artistic repertory," staged *The Winter's Tale* "on a Shakespearean stage designed by E. Hamilton Bell from recently discovered historical data."[34] John Corbin, who had urged the utilization of an Elizabethan stage, was the advisor on this production. "That the method resulted in a fresh and new delight was instantly recognized," he wrote, and this was, he continued, "the most accurate and beautiful reconstruction of the Elizabethan stage which has ever been achieved."[35] The orchestra space at the New Theatre was floored over and the stage extended to the first row of seats. A gallery reached around the back of the stage, and "beneath the gallery, in the middle, was a small alcove or inner stage in which the use of properties or bits of scenery indicated the location of the action."[36] According to the program for *The Winter's Tale,* "when the inner stage is hidden, the stage represents a place not distinctly indicated—such as a road, a city, or a street. It is believed that this latter feature of the Elizabethan stage is first illustrated in America by the present setting." This stage was evidently much more decorative than the ones designed by Ben Greet, for Eaton spoke of the "rich background of medieval tapestries and the architectural detail" of the setting.[37] The prestige value of a production at the New Theatre was enormous, and this performance of *The Winter's Tale* indicated, at least, that a "primitive treatment of scenery" once condemned by Tree, was now acceptable to the wealthy, socially prominent patrons who sponsored this lavish theatre.

---

[25] *Theatre Magazine,* IV (April 1904), 83.

[26] Greet, *loc. cit.*

[27] John Corbin, "Shakespeare and the Plastic Stage," *Atlantic Monthly,* XCVII (March 1906). 374.

[28] Montrose J. Moses, *The American Dramatist* (Boston, 1917), p. 314. The Charles Coburn company toured outdoor theatres with sixteen of Shakespeare's comedies and tragedies in the years just before the First World War.

[29] Ralph Bergengren, "The Elizabethan Theatre at Harvard University," *Theatre Magazine,* VII (December 1907), 345.

[30] Mary Caroline Crawford, "Maude Adams in *Twelfth Night,*" *Theatre Magazine,* VIII (August 1908), 219.

[31] *Ibid.*

[32] Walter P. Eaton, *At the New Theatre and Others* (Boston, 1910), p. 80.

By the period of this production, the discussion over whether Shakespeare should be performed on an Elizabethan stage was obviously less controversial and the advocates of the platform stage less voluble. For one reason, in the second decade of the century, very few critics any longer had a favorable comment to make on the old-fashioned scenery of Tree and his followers. Even the rather conservative English critic John Palmer wrote in 1913, "Sir Herbert Tree overwhelms himself, his company and his author in irrelevant sumptuous detail, which . . . distracts the imagination and gives one an impression that author and actors are making perpetual desperate efforts to out-Herod their surroundings."[38] Furthermore, stimulated by the many magazine discussions and by the tours of Greet and his company, the amateur and semi-professional "little theatre" groups being formed all over the United States after 1900 had accepted simplified settings wholeheartedly and were regularly putting into practice the ideas of Greet and the other proponents of Elizabethan staging.

Another factor which was influencing the acceptance of the platform stage for Shakespeare was the increasing popularity of outdoor performances. The interest in open-air drama in America had begun in the early nineties in the period when the Elizabethan Stage Society in England was attempting to "reform" Shakespearean staging in indoor theatres. Research growing out of the "antiquarian" movement had shown that the popular theatre of the classic and medieval periods was an outdoor theatre. Scholars pointed out that it was Greek drama which seemed most to demand outdoor production. Consequently many of the early open-air performances were of Greek plays rather than of Shakespeare. In the American professional theatre during the Victorian era, the plays of the Greek dramatists had appeared only occasionally, and never, of course, in outdoor productions. Towards the end of the century, college performances were relatively frequent, usually being given in the original Greek. In 1881, for example, the year in which the first effort was made in London to play *Hamlet* on an Elizabethan stage, *Oedipus the King* was given in Greek at Harvard using the platform in Sanders Theatre. On one occasion in the late eighties a Greek tragedy was actually performed in New York when David Belasco produced *Electra* in March, 1889, for the Academy of Dramatic Art. "The persons represented in the tragedy stood or moved upon the elevated rear portion of the stage which showed the entrance to a Greek house with a view of the countryside to the right and to the left."[39] A photograph of the setting shows that the front portion of the Lyceum Theatre stage, which was extended out into the auditorium, had an altar in the center. The scenery was all two dimensional with painted shadows.[40]

---

[33] *Theatre Magazine,* XI (May 1910), 133.

[34] *Ibid.*

[35] Corbin, "Shakespeare his Own Stage Manager," p. 267.

[36] *Outlook,* XCIV (April 9, 1910), 784.

[37] Eaton, *At the New Theatre and Others,* p. 81.

[38] John Palmer, *The Future of the Theatre* (London, 1913), p. 59.

It was apparently not until after 1900 that outdoor productions of Greek plays were performed in America in the formal architectural settings which were assumed to have served as their backgrounds in fifth-century Greece. The first Greek theatre in the United States was built in 1901 at Point Loma in southern California, but the stage was in the form of a Greek temple. Since this theatre was at first used only for the ceremonies of a Theosophist society, it was not until the erection of the Greek Theatre at Berkeley in 1903, on the campus of the University of California, that the general public became aware of the possibilities of the architectural stage. "It is the only structure of its kind in America and is almost exactly similar in its proportions to the classic theatre of Dionysus at Athens," reported *Harper's Weekly*.[41] Actually more Hellenistic in style, with a stage rather too high above the orchestra, this building was not very well suited to the performance of classic Greek drama employing choruses. Indeed, the student performance of Aristophanes' *The Birds,* with which the building was dedicated, was played in the circular orchestra rather than on the stage, which was partially screened from the audience with evergreens. *Twelfth Night,* acted by the Ben Greet company, was presented on the second day of the dedication ceremonies, and Racine's *Phèdre* was given in French on the third day. The significant thing about the erection of this theatre, however impractical it might be for theatrical purposes, was that it enabled American audiences for the first time to appreciate the grandeur of an outdoor performance against a majestic architectural background.

A third California theatre also was important in stimulating outdoor entertainment. The first of the Bohemian Club "grove plays" was performed in 1902, in a grove of immense redwood trees in the Russian River area of northern California. Although not open to the general public, these outdoor performances were influential because of the wide publicity given to the many famous persons who appeared on the stage of this "nature" theatre and the fame of such authors as Will Irwin, Porter Garnett, and George Sterling who wrote the scripts.

---

[39] William Winter, *The Life of David Belasco* (New York, 1918), I, 354.

[40] *Ibid.* Photograph opposite p. 354.

[41] *Harper's Weekly,* XLVII (November 21, 1903), 1860.

After the opening of the Greek Theatre at Berkeley in 1903, it was used for yearly student productions of Greek plays, and from time to time famous touring stars appeared there. Among these were Bernhardt in Racine's *Phèdre* in 1906 and 1911, Maude Adams in *L'Aiglon* and *As You Like It*, 1910,[42] Margaret Anglin in *Antigone*, 1910, and Sothern and Marlowe in *Macbeth*, 1911. On the East Coast, after Greet had played outdoors at Columbia in 1903, another outdoor performance occurred in June 1906 when the *Agamemnon* was given in the stadium at Harvard in "a reproduction of the orchestra and skene of classic Greece."[43] The Harvard stadium was again used for an outdoor production in 1909 when Maude Adams gave Schiller's *Joan of Arc* with a medieval simultaneous setting by Ernest Gros representing the garden at Domrèmy, the cathedral at Rheims, and a battlefield. Thirteen hundred participants formed the "most wonderful mob in the history of the American stage."[44]

The first permanent outdoor theatre on the East Coast was reported to be the one opened in Mt. Kisco, New York, in September, 1911. Between 1911 and 1913, *Electra, Twelfth Night*, and *Lysistrata* were among the plays presented there.[45] In 1911 when this theatre was built, Howard Kyle was listing 138 outdoor performances in a single season with the Coburn Players.[46] Beginning in 1909, the Coburn Players gave open-air performances of Shakespeare and of Percy Mackaye's *The Canterbury Pilgrims* at thirty colleges, and Coburn was soon established as the leading advocate of the open-air theatre in America. "The touring system of outdoor performances and simple settings in college and university halls . . . inaugurated by Ben Greet was taken up and pushed to completeness in this country by C. D. Coburn."[47] Coburn's "open air theatre is not only winning new devotees for the drama," wrote Kyle, "it is reclaiming others who have fallen away from their playgoing habits."[48] Two years later, Lucy Pierce asserted that "all Europe may not boast of so much outdoor arena activity in a season. Today the *al fresco* performance has become an institution. . . . Some twenty-five organized companies of professional actors exist who appear only under the open sky."[49] In fact, in this article she credits the United States with having inspired the first modern European attempts at outdoor performances.

Moreover, by 1915 these open-air performances and the indoor productions using platform settings were having some slight influence on the Broadway professional theatre; such Shakespearean stars as Annie Russell, Forbes-Robertson, Faversham, and Sothern and Marlowe were simplifying their old-style wing and drop settings, though none had attempted a reproduction of a Shakespearean theatre.[50] Indeed, it was not until after the success of the Stratford, Ontario, Shakespearean Festival in 1953 that Broadway and the American professional theatre apparently became aware of the possibilities of staging Shakespeare on something approximating an Elizabethan stage. These amateur and semi-professional productions were also preparing audiences in the commercial theatre to accept the advanced scenic designs of the "New Stagecraft" which were being imported from Europe beginning in 1912. These seemingly new staging techniques such as the forestages of Granville Barker and Jacques Copeau, the inner prosceniums, portals, and periaktoi of Joseph Urban, and the permanent architectural unit settings of Robert Edmond Jones and Lee Simonson were all derived from Greek or Elizabethan scenic devices.

---

[42] For Miss Adams' *As You Like It* the architectural stage front was hidden by blue cheesecloth and a transplanted forest.

[43] "The *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus at Harvard," *Theatre Magazine*, VI (July 1906), 173.

[44] *Theatre Magazine*, X (June 1909), 39.

[45] Arthur Row, "Open Air Theatres in America," *Harper's Weekly*, LVIII (October 4, 1913), 21. Row directed Maeterlinck's *Aglavaine and Selysette* in an outdoor performance there in 1913.

[46] Howard Kyle, "Experiences of an Open Air Actor," *Harper's Weekly*, LV (December 23, 1911), 12.

[47] Thomas Dickinson, *The Insurgent Theatre* (New York, 1917), p. 191.

[48] Kyle, p. 13.

[49] Pierce, p. 135.

[50] Moses, "The Birth of a New Art," p. 35.

The controversial discussions over the merits of Shakespearean stages and open-air theatres which had been carried on in print and on the lecture platform for two decades were to be pushed aside by the dazzling scenic innovations of this "New Stagecraft." In our time these arguments seem as quaint and as long past as those Victorian wings and drops which Irving and Tree and their followers so stoutly defended. Nevertheless, all of this enthusiasm for outdoor performances and replicas of Shakespearean stages produced a lasting influence on staging methods which has continued into our own day. We accept the Elizabethan stage as one "right way to produce Shakespeare," we are pleased by opportunities to sit out under the stars to watch a performance, and we have forgotten that controversies once raged over these matters.

AURAL RECEPTION OF SENTENCES OF DIFFERENT LENGTHS

John W. Black

GEORGE MOORE's encomium, "In the pages of Pater, the English language lies in state," by implication proffers the laurel to the long sentence. Rufus Choate was another who used long periods. A listener on the occasion of Choate's eulogy of Webster at Dartmouth College remarked of one span of words, "I wondered whether or not he would make port." The object of the present study pertained to the lengths of sentences, to heard sentences, and to intelligibility of the words of the sentences, not directly to the aesthetics of style. Specifically, does the length of a sentence affect the listener's identification of the words of the sentence, and as the conditions of listening are made more noisy is the resulting deleterious effect on auditory reception equally serious to sentences of various lengths?

PROCEDURE

Everyone who participated in this study held at least a bachelor's degree. Each of three persons contributed 120 original statements, fifteen sentences for each of the eight lengths: 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, and 17 words. Four judges then rated the forty-five sentences of each length on a *one-to-four* scale according to "naturalness." The judges individually said the sentences aloud a number of times and responded to the criterion, "Is this an easy, natural way of expressing this idea?" Later the sentences that met this criterion, i.e., were rated *one,* were further screened by the same judges on the basis of the likelihood that a particular sentence might be expected to occur either in speaking or in writing. The ratings led to the selection of ten sentences of each of the eight lengths as the most natural and most probable of the lot.

Five male voices recorded the eighty sentences, randomly ordered, on one channel of a multi-channel Ampex recorder. White or thermal noise was recorded on another channel.

The recordings were played back over headset circuits to four groups of forty-eight listeners. One half of each group of listeners heard the statements in a quiet condition; the other half heard one or another amount of masking noise.[1] The instruction was: *write the last three words of each statement.* Exercises in aural comprehension that include this instruction are typically difficult for foreign students who are studying advanced oral English. There was ample time between sentences for the listeners to make the responses. The level of the speech was the same from panel to panel, approximately 90 db re .0002 dyne/cm². The level of the masking noise was varied to establish four signal-to-noise ratios (10 db, 8 db, 6 db, and 4 db), one ratio per listening group.

Mr. Black is Professor of Speech and Director of Speech and Hearing Science, The Ohio State University. He was editor of Speech Monographs, *1958-59. This study was conducted at the U.S. Naval School of Aviation Medicine, N.A.S., Pensacola, under a contract between the Office of Naval Research and The Ohio State University Research Foundation.*

[1] This was in part an administrative convenience. Actually, as stated later, the results of only one-fourth of the listeners in quiet—selected by lot—were retained.

The responses were scored word by word. Each listener had the opportunity to write thirty words in response to three-word sentences, thirty words in response to five-word sentences, . . . thirty words in response to seventeen-word sentences—240 words altogether.

ANALYSIS

The scores of the experimental subjects were entered in a matrix in which the successive rows represented subjects, and successive columns represented the lengths of sentences. Five such matrices accommodated the data for the condition of quiet, and the four S/N ratios. (The number of subjects for the quiet condition was reduced by lot to agree with the number in each of the other conditions.)

Lindquist describes a procedure, Type I (mixed design), whereby data that are obtained in a series of replications, as the ones above, may be treated by a single analysis of variance.[2] The analysis tests the similarity of replications—in this case S/N ratios; of columns—in this case lengths of sentences; and the interaction between the two, i.e., whether or not the effect of noise varies with different lengths of sentences.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of variance is summarized in Table I. The three F-ratios were highly significant, indicating that both the level of the noise and the length of the statement affect auditory reception and, importantly, that a condition of noise was more deleterious to sentences of some lengths than to others. The scores of Table II clarify this observation. The values of the top and bottom rows of Table II differ in the ratio of *two to one* in the instances of 3-, 5-, and 7-word sentences; and in excess of *three to one* in 11-, 13-, 15-, and 17-word sentences.

Further examination of Table II shows that as the level of noise was increased listening scores were attenuated, and that as the length of sentences increased scores were also attenuated, at least through 13-word sentences. In other words, either an increase in noise or additional length of a sentence reduced the likelihood that a listener would identify the final three words of the sentence, and the longer the sentence the more disastrous was the effect of noise.[3] The fact that the scores in the *17-word* column of Table II are higher than the ones of the *15-word* column has been termed a "bowing upward" effect by E. C. Poulton (Medical Research Laboratory, Cambridge). This informal comment emphasized the similarity between these results and the outcomes in his experiments in which human participants made an all-out effort in connection with final and most difficult conditions and scored better than on earlier and easier conditions. Since the order of the present stimuli was randomized this explanation is probably not applicable. Rather, one that bears testing is that with the longest sentences the phrasing of the readers, in part to accommodate breathing, had the effect of reducing the length of the sentence.

CONCLUSION

The relevance of these results to the composition of sentences, to phrasing in delivery, or to practices in listening is open to question. Context was minimal among the sentences; interest value was almost nil. Nonetheless, the fact that the length of sentences and the amount of environmental noise in which sentences are heard have a common aspect for the listener is noteworthy. It should be remembered that Pater's lengthy periods were for reading; Choate's listener may have been entranced by rhetorical gymnastics and quite incapable of either reproducing the words he was hearing or of passing an examination on their substance. If auditory comprehension is the goal of the speaker his sentences should be characteristically short, not long.

---

[2] E. F. Lindquist, *Design and Analysis of Experiments in Psychology and Education* (Boston, 1953).

[3] A parallel set of data reduced from answers to factual questions, one question per sentence, is not reported, but was essentially a duplicate of the results of Tables I and II.

TABLE I

SUMMARY OF AN ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SCORES THAT REPRESENT CORRECT COPYING OF THREE WORDS PER STATEMENT.

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Variance	F	P
Between Subjects	(119)			
Signal-to-noise ratio (B)	4	6,180.55	378.25	<.001
Error (b)	115	16.34		
Within Subjects	(840)			
Length of Sentence (A)	7	305.99	57.73	
Interaction (AB)	28	38.16	7.20	
Error (w)	805	5.30		

TABLE II

MEAN PERCENTAGE OF CORRECT RESPONSES TO EIGHT LENGTHS OF SENTENCES UNDER FIVE EXPERIMENTAL CONDITIONS.

	Length of Sentence in Words							
	3	5	7	9	11	13	15	17
Quiet	98.6	96.9	95.9	95.1	95.4	91.1	95.5	94.7
10 db S/N Ratio	96.7	94.2	90.1	82.1	89.1	86.4	84.4	85.7
8 db S/N Ratio	85.4	82.7	83.0	66.1	79.0	79.6	75.9	81.3
6 db S/N Ratio	70.0	72.9	59.8	49.1	57.6	46.9	47.3	59.3
4 db S/N Ratio	46.7	50.0	44.9	32.9	29.8	27.3	27.0	30.5

SOME UNRESOLVED PHONETIC-PHONEMIC SYMBOLIZATION PROBLEMS

Arthur J. Bronstein

IN the Summer, 1959, issue of the *Southern Speech Journal,* C. M. Wise, reviewing Allen's recent collection of essays in applied English linguistics,[1] mentions the "battle of symbolization" as one of six facing readers of the literature in speech and linguistics. Readers of publications in speech and phonetic research may note use of various modifications of the IPA symbols; readers of other published sources dealing with phonetics, phonemics, and linguistics may find the same symbols or, more probably, those stemming from an analysis of the structure of English by Trager and Smith,[2] one of the most widely followed systems in American-English linguistics today.

The problem of symbolization is not dismissed by assuming that a phonetician uses one set of symbols, and that a linguist or phonemicist uses another. In fact, a person can hardly be one without being a good part of the others. Phonetic texts and pronunciation manuals use the IPA symbolization for both phonetic and phonemic concepts.[3] Phonemic concepts are not overlooked in the study of phonetics, and no phonemic concepts can proceed without the phonetic data.

The problem of symbolization faces every writer of a text or article in this field, if not every teacher and student of speech analysis who must be prepared to cope with the problem that results when different texts and reference works refer to the same speech patterns with different symbols. Some of the differences in symbolization are minor, merely representative of ease or the economics of printing, or perhaps personal desire. Here might be included the use of /š/ for /ʃ/, /č/ for /tʃ/, /ž/ for /ʒ/, /j/ for /dʒ/, and /y/ for /j/. Other differences represent differences in approach and analysis of the data. Some of these are the concern of this paper.

At least five differences of opinion can be isolated: (In accordance with the growing practice of writers in the field, diagonals are used to mark phonemes, brackets to enclose phonetic symbols. The transcriptions of all pronunciations of words are shown in IPA symbols and are enclosed in brackets.)

1. The symbol /r/ and the sounds it may represent:
    a. The prevocalic, consonantal functioning sound, as in *red* and *brown*: [rɛd, braʊn];
    b. The stressed syllabic of *bird*: [br̩d], [bɜd], [bɝd];
    c. The unstressed syllabic of *father*: [fɑðr̩, fɑðə, fɑðɚ];
    d. The unstressed non-syllabic of *fear*: [fɪr, fɪə, fɪɚ].

Mr. Bronstein is Associate Professor of Speech, Queens College, New York. Some of the ideas in this paper were presented to the Voice, Phonetics, and Linguistics Interest Group at the 1959 SAA convention, Washington, D. C.

[1] Harold B. Allen, *Readings in Applied English Linguistics* (New York, 1958).

[2] George L. Trager and Henry Lee Smith, Jr., *An Outline of English Structure,* Studies in Linguistics: Occasional Papers No. 3 (Norman, Oklahoma, 1951).

[3] See, for example, Clifford M. Prator Jr., *Manual of American English Pronunciation* (New York, 1957), and Charles K. Thomas, *An Introduction to the Phonetics of American English,* 2nd ed. (New York, 1958).

2. The vowel structure of American English:
   - a. Are there, as posited by Trager and Smith, nine simple American-English vowels, exemplified by the following key words: *pit, pet, pat, "just," putt, pot, put, whole* (ENE), and *pot* (ENE)? These vowels are arranged by them in the symmetrical pattern noted in Table I.
   - b. Are there fifteen simple vowel phonemes, as noted by Kenyon in his well-known chart of the tongue positions for the vowels of American English?[4] This chart is reproduced in Table II.
   - c. Or does the inventory of the simple vowel nuclei in American English demonstrate the need for a transcription system that permits fifteen vowel differences, as recently submitted by Stockwell?[5] Stockwell's grid, which he notes as allowing "for transcription of all the differences which have been discussed as being possibly phonemic," is noted in the commonly used IPA symbols, with the execption of the digraph symbol /Æ/, which he indicates is needed for the contrast made by certain speakers between *air* [æh] and *ire* [Æh]. The /h/ signifies an offglide to the mid and/or high central section of the mouth. Stockwell's vowel chart appears in Table III.
3. The "barred *i*" phoneme, /ɪ̈/:[6] Is it a phoneme, separately identifiable as such in American English, or is it merely a variant of /i/, /ɪ/, /ə/, or /ʌ/?
4. The schwa and caret symbols: Are unstressed and stressed [ə] and [ʌ] allophones of the same entity? Or is /ə/ a separate phoneme in our language?
5. The offglide forms of the complex clusters: Are /w, j, r/ in the offglide position of vocalic clusters glides or semivowels: [haw] or [haʊ]; [fayn] or [faɪn]; [fɪh, fɪhr] or [fɪə, fɪɚ, fɪr]?

Decisions for three of the above items, 2, 4, and 5, will be made more readily when more evidence is available. Even though these decisions will always be influenced, to some degree, by personal preference, they are more apt to be influenced by phonetic and phonemic evidence. The three tables that chart the simple vowels of American English do not reflect the conclusions of still other phoneticians. There is not, as yet, complete agreement, partly because much evidence about the vowels and their variants in the different dialects is still needed, and partly because American phoneticians, trained in the IPA system, see great value in retaining this carefully worked out system. Their primary concern is with the recognition and identification of sounds and, therefore, phonemic decisions that seem to omit some of the phonetic evidence give them pause.

Item 4 presents a somewhat similar problem. Much current linguistic writing is moving in the direction of a single sound for both [ə] and [ʌ]. The strong desire to retain /ə/ for the unstressed form only is based on a recognition of a large group of unstressed sounds, acoustically very similar, and seemingly best identified by a single symbol. Kenyon, in the previously cited *American Pronunciation* (page 72), adds the objection that "however valuable for linguistic analysis, a system that writes the same symbol in stressed and unstressed positions . . . tends to defeat [the student's] understanding of vowel and consonant gradation. . . ." Phoneticians have continued to keep /ə/ for unstressed forms only (with very few exceptions), whereas

---

[4] John S. Kenyon, *American Pronunciation*, 10th ed. (Ann Arbor, 1951), p. 61.

[5] Robert P. Stockwell, "Structural Dialectology: A Proposal," *American Speech*, XXXIV (December 1959), 258-268.

[6] Throughout this essay the symbol [ɪ̈] is used to represent the "barred *i*."

TABLE I

The Trager-Smith Vowel Arrangement. The symbols are those used in the Trager-Smith *Outline of English Structure.*

	Front	*Central*	*Back*
High	i (pit)	ɨ ("just")	u (put)
Mid	e (pet)	ə (putt)	o (ENE—home)
Low	æ (pat)	a (pot)	ɔ (aural; ENE—pot)

TABLE II

Kenyon's chart of the tongue positions for the vowels of American English.

	Front	*Central*	*Back*
High	i (beat)		u (pool)
	ɪ (bit)		ʊ (pull)
Mid	e (bait)	ɝ ɚ (further)	o (coat)
	ɛ (bet)	ɜ ə	
Low	æ (bat)	ʌ (cut)	
			ɔ (law)
			ɑ (father)
		a (ask—ENE)	ɒ (fodder—ENE)

TABLE III

Stockwell's chart of the simple (vowel) nuclei of American English. Fifteen vowels are needed to permit the contrasts as indicated.

	Front	*Central*	*Back*
High	i (leash)		u (buoy)
	ɪ (fish)	ï ("just")	ʊ (bush)
Mid	e (Hague)		o (no as [now])
	ɛ (leg)	ə (above)	ʌ (no as [nʌw])
Low	æ (air)		ɔ (law as [lɔh])
	Æ (ire)	a (are—Southern)	ɑ (law as [lɑh])

[ï] is used to represent the "barred *i*" symbol.

phonemicists desire greater structural consistency: one vowel symbol for each simple vowel, stressed or unstressed.

Item 5 presents a preference based on similar evidence. Those who desire to retain the vowel symbols in the offglide position do so because of the traditional use of symbolizing diphthongal forms with vowel symbols, and because of the acoustic evidence. For them, the semivowel-glide symbols are used only in prevocal positions. Phonemicists who prefer the use of the semivowels in the offglide positions do so primarily in order to show the contrasts between the two parts of these complex vowel clusters.

In all three instances, the student of American English will have to defend his choice of symbols on the grounds of the phonetic accuracy of all the evidence available to him as well as by his desires for phonemic consistency. He can, of course, decide to use two complete sets of symbols—one for phonetic forms and one for phonemic decisions—hardly a desirable conclusion.

The remaining two items, 1 and 3, are the main concern of this paper. Both are problems of identification. Decisions on the /r/ can be made from the available evidence. It does not seem likely that new evidence will necessitate new conclusions, even though many students of our language seem to have avoided drawing any conclusions on this matter. In treating the "barred *i*," the problem of phonetic identification is presented first and then its possible acceptance in the phonemic systems of some American speakers. Here the evidence is far from complete and tentative conclusions are, therefore, more understandable.

THE /r/ PHONEME

One of the most confusing sounds in American speech is the /r/ phoneme. Recently, Curtis and Hardy[7] recognized that the differences of opinion in analyzing and evaluating these /r/ forms lead to different approaches in the analysis of the misarticulation of /r/. Perhaps the trouble has been that we have been trying to discuss /r/ in American speech as though it behaved like other consonants in the language. The /r/ does not seem to do so. It differs structurally from all other consonants, fricative or frictionless. The /r/ behaves differently when prevocalic or postvocalic for many speakers in the South and the Coastal East. The result is that American English has at least three or four clearly identifiable allophones in prevocalic position: the fricative-like sound of *dread,* [ɹ]; the non-fricative initial sound of *red,* [r]; the voiceless sound in *cream,* [r̥]; and an occasional flapped or trilled *r,* sometimes heard after /θ/, as in *thread,* [ř]. Five postvocalic *r* forms may appear in such words as *third* and *father,* variously represented in different sources as [r̩, ɝ, ɜ] for the vowel in *third,* and [r̩, ɚ, ə] for the unstressed syllable of *father.* Most readers are aware of the differences of representation here. Some phoneticians use the glide symbol /r/ for both prevocal and postvocal positions ([rɛd, fɪr]), so that it fits the structural pattern of other consonants. [rɛd] and [tɛd] are minimal pairs, as are [fɪr] and [fɪt]. Some transcribe such words as *third* and *better* with syllabic *r* sounds; [θrd, bɛtr]. Still others use [r] only when it appears as a non-syllabic sound. At other times, vowel symbols are used, and different syllabics are used for the "r" or "r-less" patterns: [θɜd, θɝd, fɑðə, fɑðɚ]. Some phoneticians show the differences between the "r-less" speakers of the East and the retaining of postvocalic *r* in the West by transcribing two forms of *third* as [θəd] and [θərd], much to the discomfort of many who do not hear four phonemes in *third.* Some of the difficulty can be explained by the assumption that three distinctive (phonemic) sounds can be isolated in American English (/r, ɜ or ɝ, ə or ɚ/), and that with these three sets of symbols any of the forms of orthographic *r* could be transcribed. However it is useful to remember that all these *r* forms, even in "r-less" speech, are still parts of the /r/ phoneme—that [ɜ] and [ɝ] vary freely in some dialects (as in New York City speech and some dialects of the South), that [ɜ-ə] and [ɝ-ɚ] differ from each other in stress only, while the members of one pair do not contrast phonemically with the members of another. [θɜd] and [θɝd], [fɑðə] and [fɑðɚ] do not make contrasting pairs in English. These four sounds are allophonic variants of each other, and all members of the phonemic concept which is called /r/. There is nothing wrong, however, in the consistent use of the symbol for the sound in consonantal or vocalic positions of the word or phrase. The confusion arises in forgetting the relationship of [ɝ] to [ɚ], and of both to /r/, of which they are allophones.

---

[7] James F. Curtis and James C. Hardy, "Phonetic Study of Misarticulation of /r/," *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research,* II (September 1959), 244-257.

The reasons for retaining the phonetic symbols [ɜ, ɝ, ə, ɚ] are strong, and few phoneticians concerned with American speech seem willing to forego their use. When /r/ is compared with the other glides /w, j/ or with other sounds that can and do act as syllabics (/l, m, n/), the following points become clear:

a. The use of a postvocalic [r] symbol in *fear* or *fair* calls for the use of a postvocalic [j] and [w], as Hultzén noted in an earlier study.[8]
b. Stressed [ɝ] and unstressed [ɚ] are the variant forms of [ɜ] and [ə], as in *murmur* and *burner*. Retaining the [r] symbol for one dialect and the vowels [ɜ-ə] for others, would not show the appropriate relationship.
c. [ɝ] and [ɚ] are vowel symbols and are easily recognized as such.
d. Although /l, m, n, r/ may function as syllabics in English, /l, m, n/ do so in unstressed syllables only. Syllabic /r/ appears, however, in both stressed and unstressed syllables, as in *bird* and *batter*. And although the relationship of [i-u-ɝ] to [j-w-r] seems clear, the special circumstances of [ɜ-ə], of "r-less" *murmur,* and their relation to /r/ have no counterpart in the other glides.

For these reasons, American phoneticians seem to prefer to retain the four vowel symbols [ɜ, ɝ, ə, ɚ]: the first two for the common allophonic variants of *bird,* the last two for the variants in *father,* and the [r] for the consonantal position found before and between vowels, as in *red* and *very.*

The "Barred *i*" Phoneme

This sound, hardly mentioned except as a variant of [ɪ] in some phonetic texts, is a generally unrecognized phoneme. Current American speech texts make no mention of it as a distinctive sound of American English and the basic texts in the speech field do not include it among the listed sounds of the language. Since the publication of the Trager-Smith *Outline* in 1951, this sound has come under widespread examination, and students of phonemics are seeking additional evidence to substantiate the structuralists' observation that places three high, short vowel phonemes in the front, central, and back positions: /ɪ, ɪ̈, ʊ/. Writers are beginning to recognize a separate identity for /ɪ̈/, distinct from /ɪ/ and /ə/. The presence of phonemic /ɪ̈/ is established by phonemic contrast, at least in certain dialects of American speech, between *rivet* with /ɪ/ and *river* with /ɪ̈/; *gist* with /ɪ/, "just now" with /ɪ̈/, and *just* with /ʌ/; "will he" with /ɪ/ and *Willie* with /ɪ̈/; "pretty girl" with /ɪ/ and "pretty good" with /ɪ̈/. Stressed /ɪ̈/ does not seem to be as common as unstressed /ɪ̈/, although many speakers use the sound in words like *sister, thing,*

---

[8] Lee S. Hultzén, "Symbol for the Nonsyllabic Postvocalic R of General American," *QJS,* XXXVI (April 1950), 189-201.

fist, fish and *chips*. The sound is centralized and the lips are in neutral position. Careful speakers who try to avoid using /ī/ can usually manage to do so in all instances. There seem to be no words in which /ī/ is consistently used by all speakers of American English, yet the evidence is increasing that, at least in colloquial speech, this sound is found in all dialects of American English. The analysis of the available evidence points to these conclusions: (a) "barred *i*" is a variant of /ɪ/ for many speakers in certain words; (b) "barred *i*" is a distinctly separate phoneme in the speech of many persons. It is reported as a consistent sound in the speech of many speakers in such words as *children* [tʃīldrīn], *me* and *see* [mīi, sīi], *tune* and *duty* [tīun, [dīuti]; in stressed syllables before /l/ plus a consonant, as in *silver, milk,* and *build* [sīlvɚ, mīlk, bīld]; in certain small words such as *in, his, with, its, if,* and *is*; in the unstressed *-ed* and *-es* endings, as in *parted* and *horses*; and in the word *can,* in such a phrase as "I can see."

The evidence of the phonemic incidence of this sound in all or most American-English dialects is not clearly established. There is, however, little doubt as to its use and the evidence certainly does not warrant continuing a "careless" or "less cultivated" label for it. It is a "controversial" sound. It is not always recognized largely because (a) all can avoid using it, substituting /ɪ/ or /ə/ for the same word, and (b) it has no special spelled form with which it can be associated. Phonemicists, interested in the structure of our language, believe it is phonemically identifiable and that it fits the structural pattern. Not everyone is so convinced. Does the symbol /ī/ belong in texts and writings as a phoneme, in any of the dialects, or in American English as a whole? Or is it just a variant or allophone of another vowel? In either case, can the symbolization for this sound continue to be overlooked in so much of the writing?

CONCLUSION

There are clear differences of opinion facing the reader and writer of the literature in the speech field, with particular reference to the symbolization being used for the allophones of /r/ and /ī/, among other problems. The symbolization decided on is not the result of whim, but rather the result of different interpretations of the sound structure of American English.

The influence of the phonemicists and phoneticians upon each other is great, and it is obvious that neither can overlook the discipline and conclusions of the other. Trying to keep up with the literature, especially since it is complicated by different symbolization at times, is a challenging task. There is at least solace in knowing that whatever conclusion the reader comes to—even if it differs from the one he is then reading—he will be in good scholarly company.

THE PRESIDENTIAL DEBATES AND THE SPEECH PROFESSION

Austin J. Freeley

THE Kennedy-Nixon debates of 1960 were unique, and perhaps decisive events, in American history. Never before had presidential candidates met in debate. Future historians will render the final judgment, but many students of public opinion regard them as the critical events of the campaign. On the eve of the election *The New York Times* cited the debates as "the really decisive factor" in the election.[1] Elmo Roper reports that six per cent of the voters, over four million people, ascribed their final decision to the debates alone. Of these four million, seventy-two per cent voted for Kennedy.[2] The first debate may have been critical; Charles A. H. Thompson, specialist in communications for the Rand Corporation of California, in a lecture at the Brookings Institution, said that the first debate was clearly the turning point in the election and gave the Presidency to Kennedy.[3]

The Kennedy-Nixon debates will continue to be a subject of study by those interested in speech and debate. Appropriately enough, the speech profession played a role in bringing about these debates. Some of the preliminary work was done by teachers of public address, and much of the initial support for the debates came from speech associations. The purpose of this article is to record the role of the speech profession in the "great debates" of 1960 and to suggest a course of action for the future.

1958—A BEGINNING

During the summer of 1958, in rereading the Lincoln-Douglas debates, I began to wonder what could be done to expand the use of debate on the contemporary political scene. It seemed likely that teachers of speech, especially those most familiar with public address and debate, would agree that debate was a method of decision making ideally suited to political campaigns.

The idea of rival candidates for political office meeting in debate is at least as old as Lincoln and Douglas. There exists a considerable body of precedent for candidates other than presidential meeting in debate. It is a tradition in Ohio that candidates for governor, senator, and mayor of Cleveland meet in debate before the City Club of Cleveland. In 1948 Dewey and Stassen, then candidates for the Republican presidential nomination, met in a nationally broadcast debate. Before 1960, however, no effort to provide for presidential campaign debates had gained sufficient support to offer any hope of success.

The situation in 1960 seemed to present optimum conditions for such debate. Neither candidate was the incumbent. Since both Kennedy and Nixon were committed to extensive campaigns,

Mr. Freeley is Associate Professor of Speech and Director of Forensics, John Carroll University. He is chairman of the Committee on Presidential Campaign Debates.

---

[1] *The New York Times*, Nov. 6, 1960, Sec. 4, p. 1.

[2] The results of the Roper Poll were first published by Frank Stanton in "An Appeal to the American People," *TV Guide*, Jan. 14-20, 1961, p. 26.

[3] *The Sun* (Baltimore), December 16, 1960, p. 8.

neither could decline to debate on the grounds of pressures of official duties. Even in 1958 it was clear that Kennedy and Nixon were the leading contenders for the nominations. Of all the potential candidates these two seemed most likely to agree to debate. Both had previous successful experience in political debates. Nixon had won his House seat in a campaign which featured a series of debates with his incumbent opponent, Jerry Voorhis. Kennedy had won his Senate seat in a campaign which included a series of debates with his incumbent opponent, Henry Cabot Lodge.

At the December, 1958 meeting of the American Forensic Association's Public Relations Committee, I suggested that the AFA should try to bring about debates between the presidential candidates in 1960. The committee approved the idea and arrangements were made to have a motion introduced at the business meeting. On December 29, 1958 the AFA passed a motion instructing "the Public Relations Committee to seek to arrange a debate between the presidential candidates in 1960."[4]

The AFA Public Relations Committee did not act on its instructions, perhaps because all of us felt that the chances of success were remote. The motion is significant, however, as it is the first recorded action of a speech association favoring the idea of debates between presidential candidates.

1959—"THE OLD COLLEGE TRY"

The idea of such debates continued to strike a responsive cord among speech people. On election day 1959 I sent a letter to the presidents and past presidents of the Speech Association of America and the American Forensic Association, proposing the establishment of the Committee on the 1960 Presidential Campaign for the purpose of "reviving the great tradition of the Lincoln-Douglas debates and to endeavor to arrange for the candidates for the 1960 presidential campaign to meet in public debate on the major issues of the campaign." Karl R. Wallace summed up the feelings of many when he wrote, "I don't know why we shouldn't give your project the old college try."[5] When the replies were in, all of the past presidents of the AFA and almost all the past presidents of SAA had given their support and joined the Committee on the 1960 Presidential Campaign. The few who declined to join the committee cited advanced years, ill health, or the pressures of other duties as reasons which prevented them from assuming any additional responsibilities. The members of the committee recognized that the task was difficult, and there was no assurance of success, but the spirit of "give it the old college try" prevailed.

A REVERSAL AND SUCCESS

As its first action, the committee sought the endorsement of SAA. Paul Carmack represented the committee in presenting to the SAA Legislative Assembly Resolutions Committee, at the SAA convention in Washington, D. C., 1959, this resolution:

> That the Speech Association of America join with other professional speech associations in calling upon the candidates for the Presidency and other high public office to meet in public debate during the campaign of 1960.

The resolution was not reported out of the Assembly Resolutions Committee,[6] and the Assembly Executive Committee disapproved the proposal. An explanation of what may come to be regarded as an extraordinary decision was made by a member of the Resolutions Committee:

---

[4] *The Register,* VII (Winter, 1959), 3.

[5] Letter to the author from Karl R. Wallace, November 18, 1959.

[6] See "Action Report Q," *QJS,* XLVI (April 1960), 192.

> The basic reason for the disapproval was that the members of these two committees felt that the SAA should not be involved in any political activities.[7]

The American Forensic Association had no such qualms. On December 29, 1959, the association, meeting at the same time and place as SAA, adopted the resolution with the appropriate change in name of the endorsing association.[8] Subsequently the Committee on the 1960 Presidential Campaign was endorsed by Delta Sigma Rho and the Ohio Association of College Teachers of Speech. Each supporting organization named representatives to the committee, and it went to work in arousing interest.

Stevenson was one of the first of the candidates to respond to the committee. He advised the committee of his support of the principle of the debates and of his plans to publish an article "along the lines of the suggestion in your letter."[9] Kennedy explicitly endorsed the project. He wrote:

> I would be delighted to participate in national TV debates with the Republican candidate should I win the Democratic nomination. I think such a debate would be both educational and fruitful for the American people.[10]

With one exception all of the potential candidates contacted by the committee replied endorsing the idea. The exception was Richard M. Nixon. Despite a number of letters and telephone calls the committee was unable to get any statement from him. His administrative assistant finally replied. His statement was a bit vague:

> . . . there are many uncertainties which must be considered concerning your worth while proposal. For this reason, and because it is not possible to determine the Vice President's plans for the period following the national conventions, we are unable at this time to make a commitment such as you request.[11]

A sharp battle is reported to have raged within the Nixon camp on the subject of the debates. The professional politicians opposed them, but the public relations men insisted Nixon must debate.[12] Republican campaign manager Leonard Hall announced publicly that he was not present when Nixon made the decision to debate.[13] Kennedy welcomed the debates without hesitation and as early as August confided to a friend that he would win the election in the debates.[14]

The Columbia Broadcasting System was the first of the television networks to indicate an interest in the proposed debates. February 5, 1960 marked the first of a series of telephone conversations between the committee and network officials on the subject.[15] *The Christian Science Monitor* carried a letter from the committee urging support for the debates and was the first newspaper to add its editorial endorsement.[16]

---

[7] Letter to the author from Martin P. Andersen, Jan. 14, 1960.

[8] *The Register,* VIII (Winter, 1960), 3.

[9] Letter to Glen E. Mills from Newton E. Minow (Stevenson's law partner), January 28, 1960. See Adlai E. Stevenson, "Plan for a Great Debate," *This Week,* March 6, 1960, pp. 14-15.

[10] Letter to Annabel D. Hagood from John F. Kennedy, April 8, 1960. President Kennedy cited his heavy commitment in the primary campaigns as his reason for not responding to the committee earlier.

[11] Letter to Raymond K. Tucker from Robert H. Finch, April 25, 1960.

[12] *U. S. News and World Report,* XLIX (October 31, 1960), 30.

[13] "Meet the Press," Nov. 6, 1960.

[14] *Time,* LXXVI (November 7, 1960), 29.

[15] Hugo E. Hellman first presented the committee's proposals to CBS officials; Bower Aly made subsequent contacts with additional CBS officials.

[16] *The Christian Science Monitor,* Feb. 26, 1960, p. 14c. The editor of the *Monitor,* Erwin D. Canham, was active in debate as an undergraduate and is a member of Delta Sigma Rho. Brooks Quimby aided in presenting the committee's proposals to the *Monitor.*

On March 10, 1960 Senator Warren G. Magnuson, supported by a bipartisan group of twenty-two senators, introduced the Presidential Campaign Broadcasting Act, S.3171. One of the essential features of this act relieved the stations and networks, for 1960 only, of the obligation to provide equal time for minor parties. The legislation passed the Senate, but the House failed to act before the conventions. For a time the possibility loomed that some southern states might support a third party candidate for the presidency. In such an event, southern representatives might be expected to oppose the bill. A third party did not develop, although some southern states did set up slates of uncommitted electors for the Electoral College. During the time that the legislation was before Congress the committee conducted a letter-writing campaign to senators and representatives. The Presidential Campaign Broadcasting Act was the first piece of legislation passed in the post-convention session of the House.

The networks and the candidates then decided upon a format for the debates. Apparently the decision was made in haste. The committee recognized that the format for the debate might well pose problems and, early in January, offered its services to all concerned for the purpose of providing expert moderators at many possible locations, suggesting limitations and phrasing of debate propositions or the issues for each occasion, recommending order of speaking, time limits, and other procedural rules, and offered to make available professional advice to each candidate. Thruston B. Morton, chairman of the Republican National Committee, replied promptly to this offer:

> I appreciate very much your generous offer of assistance and you may rest assured that if these debate plans reach the developmental stage, we will be very happy to contact you.[17]

The fact is, however, that the actual details of the debates were worked out entirely without reference to the committee. Had the committee been consulted it would certainly not have recommended the joint press conference format which was so widely criticized.

THE FUTURE

Although the debates did have shortcomings—largely due to the unfortunate format—they had an unquestioned impact on national and world audiences. Newspapers in all parts of the country applauded the debates and predicted that similar debates will become a part of American politics. The Baltimore *Sun* editorialized that "the worth of debates of some sort between presidential candidates is beyond question."[18] Louis B. Seltzer, editor of *The Cleveland Press,* said that "The debates have been a tremendously useful instrument in modern American politics, and unquestionably will now form a pattern in presidential campaigns."[19] The *Kansas City Star* said that "the debates have almost certainly established a precedent for American presidential politics."[20]

Columnists joined in the plaudits and predictions. Walter Lippmann called the debates "a bold innovation which is bound to be carried forward into future campaigns and could not now be abandoned." James Reston saw the debates as "a great improvement"; Roscoe Drummond found them "an invaluable innovation"; Marquis Childs said they "added a new dimension to politics."[21]

---

[17] Letter to Glen E. Mills from Thruston B. Morton, Jan. 27, 1960.

[18] *The Sun* (Baltimore), December 6, 1960, p. 18.

[19] *The Cleveland Press,* October 20, 1960, p. 5.

[20] *The Kansas City Star,* October 22, 1960, p. 8.

The Western Speech Association and the American Forensic Association have adopted resolutions calling for continuance of debates in future campaigns. Despite this approval, however, future debates between presidential candidates are by no means assured. The Presidential Campaign Broadcasting Act made the debates possible in 1960 only. The old "equal time" law, which makes debates virtually impossible, is now in effect and will remain in effect until changed. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, has appealed to the American people to demand legislation permitting more extensive use of debates by candidates of the major parties:

> . . . there ought to be no doubt that debates would not only become a permanent feature in all future presidential campaigns but would be extended to campaigns for all elective offices. . . . The great unfinished business of the Constitution remains to assure a more informed electorate. In 1960 we found an answer in a sound and constructive use of electronic communications.[22]

The Committee on the 1960 Presidential Campaign has voted unanimously to continue. The objectives of the committee are: (1) to encourage debates between presidential candidates in 1964 and in subsequent campaigns, (2) to encourage debates between candidates for major political offices, and (3) to encourage debates between informed men on major issues of public concern.

Members of the speech profession had a role in the first presidential debates. Perhaps it was not a very significant role. What was done, however, may serve as a challenge to members of our profession, a challenge to use our influence to make fuller use of public debate as an instrument in reasoned political decisions.

---

[21] Stanton, pp. 26-29.

[22] *Ibid.*, pp. 10 ff.

THE FORUM

OFFICIAL COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

SAA INTEREST GROUP OFFICERS—1961

Administrative Policies and Practices

Chairman: George Bohman
Vice-Chairman: H. P. Constans
Secretary: Donald Streeter
Advisory Committee: Gordon Hostettler, Donald Streeter, Ralph McGinnis
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: C. Horton Talley
Representative to Committee on Ethics: John Penn

American Forensic Association

C: James H. McBath
V-C: Nicholas M. Cripe
S: Wofford Gardner
A: Herbert James, Robert Newman, Annabel Hagood
D: Mary Roberts
R: Kenneth Wilkens

Behavioral Sciences

C: R. S. Goyer
V-C: Walter Simonson
S: Robert E. Dunham
A: Wallace C. Fotheringham, Donald S. Kirk, William Sattler
D: Paul Holtzman
R: John W. Black

Business and Professional Speaking

C: Carl A. Pitt
V-C: William A. Conboy
S: Frank E. X. Dance
A: Raymond S. Ross, James N. Holm, Harold P. Zelko
D: Raymond S. Ross
R: Charles Goetzinger

Discussion and Group Methods

C: Martin Andersen
V-C: Carl A. Pitt
S: Roger Baumeister
A: Henry L. Ewbank, Jr., Donald Smith, William Howell
D: William Sattler
R: Franklyn Haiman

General Semantics and Related Methodologies

C: W. Charles Redding
V-C: Parke G. Burgess
S: Ray Tucker
A: Elton S. Carter, William Conboy, Elwood Murray
D: Charles Petrie
R: Phillip K. Tompkins

High School Discussion and Debate

C: Maurice Swanson
V-C: Calvin Heintz
S: Rev. S. E. Kalamaja, S.J.
A: Win Miller, Malcolm Bump, Marguerite Ramsey
D: Ivan Rehn
R: Al Higgins

History of Speech Education

C: Goodwin Berquist
V-C: Paul E. Ried
S: Robley Rhine
A: Milton Wiksell, John T. Rickey, Marceline Erickson
D: Milton Wiksell
R: Giles Gray

Interpretation

C: Chloe Armstrong
V-C: Wilma Grimes
S: Francine Merritt
A: Alethea Smith Mattingly, Martin Cobin, Elbert Bowen
D: Charlotte Lee
R: Claribel Baird

Parliamentary Procedure

C: Emogene Emery
V-C: Paul Carmack
S: Steven M. Buck
A: William Tacey, H. L. Ewbank, Jr., Emogene Emery
D: Thomas A. Hopkins
R: Paul Carmack

Radio-Television-Film

C: Barton Griffith
V-C: Robert Crawford
S: Gale Atkins
A: Herbert Seltz, Edgar Willis, Bruce Linton
D: J. Clark Weaver
R: Walter Emery

Rhetoric and Public Address
C: Robert Gunderson
V-C: Wayne Minnick
S: Wayne Brockriede
A: Robert Clark, Waldo Braden, H. E. Gulley
D: Leland Griffin
R: Margaret Wood

Speech and Hearing Disorders
C: Max Nelson
V-C: Arnold Aronson
S: Keith Davidson
A: Roy Tew, Charlotte Wells, John W. Black
D: Bernard Schlanger
R: Dorothy Eckelmann

Speech for Foreign and Bilingual Students
C: Paul D. Holtzman
V-C: L. S. Harms
S: Joseph Wetherby
A: A. Donald George, Johnnye Akin, A. T. Cordray
D: Joseph Wetherby
R: John W. Black

Speech for Religious Workers
C: DeWitte Holland
V-C: Alfred Edyvean
S: W. K. Clark
A: Charles Weniger, G. B. Gordon, Lionel Crocker
D: John J. Rudin II
R: James Golden

Speech in the Elementary Schools
C: Ellen Kauffman
V-C: Pearl Faulk
S: Marcella Oberle
A: Carrie Rasmussen, Elise Hahn, Jean Ervin
D: Fred Alexander
R: James E. Popovich

Speech in the Secondary Schools
C: Milton Dobkin
V-C: Doris Niles
S: Betty Mae Collins
A: Evelyn Konigsberg, Waldo Phelps, Kenneth Burns
D: Charles Balcer
R: Bea Olmstead

Theatre and Drama
C: Nathaniel S. Eek
V-C: William Work
S: Pat M. Ryan, Jr.
A: Claribel Baird, O. G. Brockett, Ethel Rich
D: Arthur Dorlag
R: Harry Carlson

Undergraduate Speech Instruction
C: Jean Mayhew
V-C: Bernard Phelps
S: Sister Annerose, O.S.B.
A: Elton Abernathy, Robert Goyer, Bernard Phelps
D: Walter Stevens
R: Hall Swain

Voice, Phonetics, and Linguistics
C: John W. Black
V-C: Donald George
S: Thelma Trombly
A: Elizabeth Carr, C. L. Shaver, C. M. Wise
D: Sheila Morrison
R: A. T. Cordray

SAA COMMITTEES—1961

The name of the chairman appears first.

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Nominating Committee: Mary Louise Gehring, Elizabeth Carr, Lionel Crocker, John Dietrich, Karl Wallace.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Committee on Committees: Kenneth Hance, Gladys Borchers, Waldo W. Braden, Douglas Ehninger, Robert C. Jeffrey, Robert G. Gunderson, Richard Murphy, Ralph Nichols, Ernest J. Wrage, Paul A. Carmack, Thomas R. Lewis, Robert T. Oliver.

Finance: Waldo W. Braden (chairman until July 1, 1961), J. Jeffery Auer (chairman after July 1, 1961), Owen Peterson, John Dietrich (after July 1, 1961), Robert C. Jeffrey.

Publications: Samuel Becker (1 yr.), Donald C. Bryant (2 yrs.), Hal Gulley (3 yrs.), Gladys Borchers, Douglas Ehninger, Richard Murphy, Robert C. Jeffrey.

Time and Place: Elise Hahn (1 yr.), Carroll C. Arnold (2 yrs.), Herman H. Brockhaus (3 yrs.), Robert C. Jeffrey.

Public Relations: Carroll Arnold (1 yr.), Robert Haakenson (2 yrs.), Robert G. Gunderson, Waldo Braden, Robert C. Jeffrey.

Consultation: Lester Thonssen, Loren Reid, Elise Hahn, John Dietrich, Kenneth Hance, Robert G. Gunderson, Robert C. Jeffrey.

Professional Ethics and Standards: Robert G. Gunderson and one member to be named by each Interest Group.

COORDINATION COMMITTEES

Committee on Cooperation between SAA and Related Organizations: Ralph G. Nichols and presidents of AETA, AFA, ASHA, NSSC, and the NUEA Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials.

Committee on Cooperation between SAA and Regional Associations: Robert G. Gunderson and the presidents of CSSA, WSA, SSA, SAES, and PSA.

SERVICE COMMITTEES

International Discussion and Debate: Franklin R. Shirley, Wayne E. Eubank, Mary Louise Gehring, Martin J. Holcomb, James H. McBath, Robert P. Newman, Brooks Quimby, Glen Mills, R. D. Mahaffey, Judith Sayers.

Committee on Archives: L. Leroy Cowperthwaite, A. Craig Baird, Paul Boase, Giles W. Gray, Paul Carmack, Gordon Thomas, Robert C. Jeffrey.

Intercollegiate Discussion and Debate: Murray Hewgill, SAA representative until January 1, 1964. The other members of the committee are representatives of AFA, DSR, PKD, PRP, TKA.

Committee on Certification of Teachers of Speech: Karl Robinson, J. Jeffery Auer, Gladys Borchers, Rupert Cortright, Karl R. Wallace.

PROJECT COMMITTEES

Committee on Biographical Dictionary of Speech Education: Giles W. Gray, Edythe Renshaw, Douglas Ehninger.

Volume of Studies of Public Address on the Issue of Anti-Slavery and Disunion, circa 1860: J. Jeffery Auer, A. Craig Baird.

Volume of Studies in the Colonial Period of American Public Address: George V. Bohman, Orville Hitchcock, Ernest J. Wrage.

Volume of Studies in Southern Oratory: Waldo W. Braden, J. Jeffery Auer, Lindsey S. Perkins.

Volume of Studies of the Speaking in the Age of the Great Revolt; 1870-1898: Lindsey S. Perkins, Robert G. Gunderson, Hollis L. White.

AD HOC COMMITTEES

Assistance to Foreign Universities: Martin Bryan, Gladys Borchers, Laura Crowell, Leslie R. Kreps, Sumner Ives, Robert T. Oliver, C. M. Wise.

Constitutional Revision: Wayne N. Thompson, Carroll C. Arnold, John Dietrich, Lester Thonssen.

Committee to Prepare a Brochure on Opportunities in Speech: J. Jeffery Auer, the Executive Secretary, and the editors of the journals.

National Council of Teachers of English Liaison Committee: Wallace A. Bacon and Donald C. Bryant, SAA representatives.

COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Credentials: Henry L. Ewbank, Jr., Merrill T. Baker, Charles McGlon, Arthur Eisenstadt, Hollis White.

Resolutions: Milton Dobkin, Wayne C. Minnick, Coleman C. Bender, Elton Abernathy, Eleanor Luse.

Rules: Paul Carmack, Wayne Thompson, Ernest Wrage, Wayne Brockriede, Thomas Hopkins.

Executive Committee: Donald Bird, Paul H. Boase, J. Calvin Callaghan, Paul Carmack, H. Phillip Constans, Albert J. Croft, Henry L. Ewbank, Jr., Kim Giffin, McDonald Held, Ray Irwin, Robert Kully, Eleanor M. Luse, James H. McBath, Ralph Y. McGinnis, Wilbur E. Moore, Lawrence Mouat, James Robinson, Wayne Thompson, Charlotte Wells, Donald M. Williams, Ernest Wrage, and representatives of ASHA and AETA.

Nominating Committee (Legislative Assembly): Robert Huber, Paul Brandes, Frank Davis, William McCoard, Karl Wallace.

NEA AND SAA

To the Editor:

In the December, 1960, issue, The Forum carried a letter from J. Jeffery Auer, then Executive Vice President of SAA, in which he indicates that "The Administrative Council has now directed the constitution revision committee to prepare an appropriate statement for inclusion in the SAA constitution. 'Each Department shall require elective officers to be members of the NEA.'" He further states that the present officers of the SAA "are now enrolled in the NEA," through action of the Administrative Council. (He does not indicate how these membership dues were handled.)

I think that it would be unfortunate to place such a provision on officer qualifications without such a requirement on SAA general membership.

I have been a sustaining member of the SAA for nearly twenty years. I have also been a member of the NEA and its local state association and the American Federation of Teachers. I finally decided to drop my membership in the NEA and the local state association several years ago because I could not participate effectively in both the NEA and the AFT. I preferred the program and action of the AFT. This is true of an increasing number of public school teachers, and the number of AFT college and university locals is increasing also.

While it is true that the NEA is a large national educational organization, I believe that many of its members have joined through various types of pressures; one of the newest types of pressure is suggested by the SAA's contemplated constitutional change. Far too many teachers join the NEA because their superintendents or administrators, who often direct NEA policies, "urge" them to join. In some schools a teacher will make a motion at the first faculty meeting somewhat along these lines: "I move that all teachers of .... school join the NEA and the state association and that their dues be taken out of the first paycheck." Many teachers join the NEA, which maintains a large, but often relatively disinterested, membership.

Time does not permit a discussion of the advantages of membership in the major educational organizations—AFT, NEA, and the AAUP. While not agreeing with many of the recommendations, I would like to suggest that teachers might find Myron Lieberman's new book, *The Future of Public Education,* informative and interesting. He discusses the three organizations in his book.

I sincerely hope that the SAA does not adopt the suggested change in the constitution. Let the NEA promote its own membership. We in the SAA should encourage qualified speech teachers to become members of the SAA. I believe it would be very unwise to place such specific membership restrictions on officers of the Speech Association of America.

Richard J. Brett
Waukegan Township High School
Waukegan, Illinois

ST. LOUIS SAA CONVENTION

To the Editor:

The Speech Association of America has enough faults without having to present them openly and publicly at conventions. One would expect serious students in speech to be competent in the various aspects of their field, but the St. Louis convention managed to refute this naive belief. A few good, worthwhile, significant contributions were hidden in a morass of dull reports, pseudo-scientific experiments, unoriginal ideas, and panels that continued almost interminably for no good reason. While the combined learning at the convention did not throw speech back into the dark ages, neither did it advance speech much.

The language I use is admittedly strong and even loaded, but this does not prevent it from being accurate. Obviously, to me, much of the convention was a disappointment. I was not alone; many persons I talked with at the convention were also unhappy with the affair. At the end of the first day, two graduate students, intelligent and competent in speech, came to me and said, "Is this what Speech is like? We are really disappointed." If good students are disappointed in speech, they will not stay in it, and the field will be the worse for it.

I can comment only on the aspects of the convention associated with rhetoric, public address, forensics, and communication, since these were the panels I attended. (As a matter of fact, the meetings in interpretation were reported to be quite good.) I would make two major criticisms of the sessions: the material was of low quality, and the panels were unjustifiably long.

Poor scholarship is inexcusable at a convention, and yet of the thirty-two papers and reports I heard, only nine seemed to me to be good, scholarly contributions to the field. I do not mean they were earth-shaking, either, just good, thoughtful papers that one would expect at a convention. But the rest of the papers! Generalities, rehashing of the obvious, insignificant topics, pedestrian treatment of pedestrian subjects.

The experimental studies I heard would shame any psychologist with a conscience: no control groups, rampant variables not accounted for, and one experiment which did not test what the rest of the paper talked about. One speaker, reporting on results of an inconclusive experiment, had the wit to call it a pseudo-experiment, but he was alone in his honesty.

Some of the speakers announced the fact that they had been assigned their topics by the chairman, probably so the audience would understand their lack of fiery interest or deep knowledge concerning their subject. In one panel in the high school speech area, at least two members did not know they were on the panel until they saw their names in the printed program.

What the papers lacked in quality, they made up for in length. Many of the panels ran right up to the wire or even overtime; in only two that I attended was there time for questions and discussion. The two factors involved are the length of the papers and the size of the panel. Both were at fault. Several panels had too many speakers, and many speakers went far beyond their time limit. For example, one panel was composed of six speakers, each with a ten minute time limit. The first one stuck close to the limit. The next three ran 15, 15, and 18 minutes. The fifth speaker, out of consideration to the restless audience, omitted four pages out of a seven page speech which would have been within the time limit, but the sixth speaker talked 13 minues. After this the chairman concluded the panel. The pity was that only three of the papers were worth even 10 minutes, and these were the short ones. Some other panels were similar. Of all people, teachers of public speaking should be able to speak within a specific time. And if the speaker does not do this, the chairman must have the sense to stop him. There is no excuse on either side. Of course, a chairman may say, "To hell with time, it's the ideas that are important." This chairman should be replaced. If the ideas are important, then reduce the size of the panel, so each member will have enough time but the group will be within the time limit. Or hold a second panel. But do not betray the audience, the other members of the panel, and the other meetings by ignoring the schedule.

Conventions are also places to meet friends and associates, and this is an important function. I am sure this occurred well at St. Louis. But we should not have to say upon returning that the people were fine and the panels were poor.

There are several possible improvements which might be made, but clearly no convention in any field is going to be the best of all possible conventions. One suggestion is to have fewer meetings of some interest groups and fewer papers. There may be the objection that we have many papers to be given—we cannot cut down the participation. This overlooks the possibility that one-third to one-half of the papers are not worth listening to and could be eliminated without loss to the normal member of SAA.

Fewer meetings of some of the interest groups would allow more listening to panels which previously conflicted. Note that the American Forensic Association had seven meetings, rhetoric and public address had nine, National Society for the Study of Communication six, and the two high school groups seven. Many of these section meetings conflicted, and yet it is highly probable that persons interested in one of these would be interested in most of the others. If the number of meetings were reduced, each member could better satisfy his interests. And if the poor papers were the ones omitted, no quality would be sacrificed.

There is the problem of how to eliminate the poor papers and keep the good. Obviously, the SAA cannot hold a huge contest, like the Voice of Democracy or the American Legion Oratory Contest. But if fewer papers were selected, the poorer papers would be weeded out to a greater extent. It might be wise for some groups to *call* for papers, as many conventions and conferences do, and then select the panels and papers from among those submitted. This would provide motivation for many who would not be motivated by an assignment from a chairman. It would assure the interest of the speaker and would probably improve the quality to some extent, because more ideas and research contributions would be stimulated by an open topic. Certainly, additional panels and speakers can be planned to augment the contributed papers, so that various areas may be covered.

It would also be wise to get feedback (the new prestige word) from the conventioneers to find out what they would like to hear discussed or reported. Polls, whether written or oral, might elicit some good ideas for interesting panels. After all, if the members feel the need for a particular topic or problem to be discussed, this is what a convention should discuss. This will help the meetings focus on the ideas and subjects which the audience feels are important.

Some different and experimental kinds of organization should be used. The AFA, for example, held a regular debate on one of the thorny problems in forensics. Perhaps one-man papers with a critic or a panel to cross-examine or comment, group discussions, debates, Socratic dialogues, and other forms could be used. Surely some topics are better handled by means other than three men each reading a paper.

This brings up the need for responsible chairmen who know what they should do and who will accept the responsibility of doing it. The person who designates the chairmen should know also; he should make clear the role of the chairman.

Some of the panels are important and some of the speakers are superb. Let's put these where more of the convention can attend, at times when there is little or no conflict. But above all, let's have significant and worthwhile ideas. This is the purpose of a convention—to inform and to stimulate. If it does not do this, it does not serve us well.

ARTHUR HASTINGS
University of Nevada

SAA CONVENTION PROGRAMS

To the Editor:

It seems ironic that the word we use to describe our professional meetings each year should be a synonym for customary or habitual behavior; in our opinion, speech *conventions* are too *conventional.*

This is hardly an original thesis. We have heard dozens of our colleagues echo this view. And yet we see the same weakness perpetuated year after year. Ten years ago, in February, 1951, this journal devoted six pages to a carefully worded and comprehensive critique of the preceding national convention; what criticisms were offered at that time are equally applicable today! In short, there is considerable room for improvement in our national conventions.

Yet desired changes have not come about for several understandable reasons. We seem unable to find the time to evaluate our experiences and to profit from them. Indeed, some of us find it a full time job to prepare for sectional meetings, let alone a convention-wide appraisal. Undoubtedly we are creatures of habit, too. We tend to do what last year's planners did. We seem to believe that imitation is a sure road to survival.

We suspect, also, that the first vice-president of the Speech Association of America looks upon January 1, 19— as a day of relief and thanksgiving, his energies exhausted, his spirit spent. No time surely for a post-mortem. And yet . . . when is there a better time?

The purpose of this review is to recommend improvements in three specific areas of convention planning: (1) methods for recording ideas, (2) the role of convention participants, and (3) improvements in convention format.

Methods for Recording Ideas

Even a casual observer of our proceedings would have to agree that there is confusion over the expected performance of a program participant. Is he expected to read from a manuscript? deliver an oration? present an extempore speech? or simply tell some homey stories? Should he make use of handouts or are they an obstacle to his contact with an audience? What about audio and visual aids? We recommend these aids to our students; should we use them ourselves?

As veteran convention-goers who have experienced some of this confusion both before and behind the platform, we should like to recommend a principle with which to guide our thinking: *as speech teachers we should engage in effective speaking at a speech convention.*

We maintain that stadardized methods of recording ideas are long overdue. To our way of thinking, every program participant should be expected to prepare certain materials.

1. The participant should prepare an abstract of what he intends to say. This abstract should be limited to 300 words and should be ready for distribution in interest group newsletters by December first. The program chairman should place one hundred copies of the cumulative program abstracts on file at the convention information office; here non-interest group members can pick up copies upon request. If there is to be a program critic, he should be supplied with this material a month in advance of the convention.

2. The participant should be expected to prepare a full content manuscript in publishable form by the opening date of the convention. (If the message is worth a speech, it is worth an article.) Such manuscripts could later be published in an "Annual Proceedings" format, expenses being covered by increased membership dues. The convention-wide use of this plan might re-

duce the number of papers given but it would probably raise their quality substantially.

3. Program participants finally should be expected to present a carefully prepared public speech. Such a speech would be aimed at a "general speech audience" rather than at research specialists and/or dissertation advisers. Because of his previous preparation, the program speaker would have no need for a manuscript or extensive notes. He would speak directly to a live audience, adapting to it as reaction demanded. There would be no handouts at the sectional meeting to distract the attention of the audience from the speaker.

There are, of course, convention programs where these methods for recording ideas would not apply. Where a panel-forum arrangement is intended with set speeches omitted, the essence of the meeting may be preserved by a chairman-appointed recorder, or even by a tape recording. Either method of preserving a record should prove helpful to future program planners. The methods of recording may vary, but the value of recording remains constant.

The Role of Convention Participants

The proposals noted above, if adopted, would result in certain changes in the role of convention personnel. Chairmen, speakers, and critics would undergo a mild transformation.

1. The art of being an effective chairman, sometimes neglected, would assume greater importance. This person would select program personnel on the basis of a careful sifting of abstracts as is currently common in the "Debut" programs. In some cases, the chairman might wish to direct the research of certain persons by outlining the scope of their studies. He would be responsible for selecting a competent critic and supplying him with content outlines a month before convention time. In addition to these functions, he would take charge of such minor and yet significant details as adequate ventilation and lighting, seating of the participants, timing the speakers, arranging for extra equipment when necessary, introducing the speakers and the program theme, and regulating the forum period. A capable chairman has a full time job!

2. The program participant, or speaker as we prefer to call him, would be expected to treat the convention speech in much the same way as he would any other public speech. The occasion would afford him the opportunity to stimulate as well as to inform. The flow of audience response and audience questions would help him in the process of clarification. Jargon could be abandoned and illustration made preeminent. The scope of his speech by the very nature of the manuscript requirement would be narrowed; thus he should not find himself attempting to cover the history of British parliamentary oratory in a ten-minute period!

3. The critic could now come into his own. Instead of synthesis or commentary, or worse still, impromptu evaluation, he could now analyze content with a thoroughness hitherto scarce indeed. Having examined précis a month before the convention and reviewed his own understanding of the areas to be covered, the critic could at last criticize —with, we trust, tact and insight.

Idealistic, you say? What is to prevent these changes from coming about? If the diagnosis is sound and the prescription fulfilled, we maintain the cure is sure to follow.

Improvements in Convention Format

There is a third area ripe for change. It is the area broadly labeled convention format. It includes the place of the interest group meeting, the keynote address, and the problem of variety in planning programs. Surely much can be done to improve these three phases of our national convention. What we seek to present here are three possibilities; we hope they may stimulate further and perhaps better suggestions.

1. We all recognize the need for some improvement in the scheduling and execution of interest group business meetings. Parkinson would have a field day with the SAA! Excessive meetings, conflict in program interests, competition of outside social activities, and late evening scheduling are parts of the problem.

Although some may not agree with us, we recommend the following solution. The first morning of the first day of the convention could be devoted to interest group and committee sessions. Four fifty-minute periods could be included within this span of time. We contend that each group could transact its essential business in one of these periods. A few time-saving devices would have to be inaugurated to be sure. The reports of project and other committees, pre-set agendas, and the nomination slate could all easily be included in the convention newsletter each interest group already circulates. A strong chairman could curtail the professional tendency many of us have to give speeches "off the cuff." In short, we maintain that by careful planning what now takes 240 minutes to accomplish could be achieved in a single 50 minute session.

All twenty interest groups could meet between 8:00 and 12:00 a.m. of the first convention day. To minimize conflict of interest, the hours of interest group meetings could be rotated each year.

2. The main convention address or keynote speech needs to be resurrected from its burial place on page fifty of the convention program. We recommend that after the hour-long convention banquet (from 12:00 to 1:00 o'clock on the first day) the keynote speaker address the entire assembly for thirty minutes. We further recommend that he be followed by a thirty-minute commentary with three members of the Association speaking for ten minutes apiece. And finally, this commentary session would be succeeded by a thirty-minute open forum. The entire keynote session would thus run from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. on the first day of the convention.

3. Lastly, in the matter of varying program format, we present the following suggestion. Why not devote three hours of a morning session to a practical demonstration of the so-called communication continuum? Why not an intensive study of freedom of speech in America in 1961, starting with student discussion, moving to a coaches' debate, and concluding with individual advocacy? Surely such a program could be jointly sponsored by several of the interest groups involved. Would this not perhaps demonstrate the kinship of these three forms far better than thirty pages of assertion in some textbook.

Criticism is not a popular art. Many program planners will take issue with what we have said here. We ask only that they make their views known whatever they may be.

The thought has occurred to us that there may be a need for a program manual to aid future convention planners. We would like to know if others agree. Should there be a demand for such a publication we are prepared to undertake the task.

Goodwin F. Berquist, Jr.
Ted J. McLaughlin
University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee

NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW

ROBERT G. GUNDERSON, *Editor*

APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF DRAMA AND THEATRE

Hubert C. Heffner

Two recent publications, Richard B. Sewall's *The Vision of Tragedy* and Eugène Vinaver's *Racine and Poetic Tragedy,* admirably illustrate the two major ways in which the scholar may approach the study of tragedy. Sewall's book, opening with an Introduction and a discussion of the Book of Job and closing with an interpretation of Faulkner's *Absalom, Absalom!,* focuses upon the central philosophical meanings of the tragic vision as he sees these, including but not restricted to tragedies designed for stage representation. The majority of the works which Sewall analyses in some detail are not written in the manner of drama. The specific plays upon which he does focus are *Oedipus the King, Doctor Faustus,* and *King Lear*. His exposition begins solidly with an insistence that all tragedy deals with and explores man's suffering and hence squarely raises questions of justice and the nature of order within the human universe. If man as agent in his predicament is to be a truly tragic protagonist, he must have certain qualities of character. As a minimum he must have an inner integrity and strength which allow him to make a counter thrust against that destiny which assails him. He cannot accept the facile and normally human compromises or explanations, such as those which the Comforters of Job urge upon him. He must persevere in the face of his disaster, even against God, the gods, or fate. He must demand to know and understand his whole guilt, just as do Job and Oedipus. Such steadfastness and courage lead through suffering to enlightenment wherein the protagonist sees more profoundly the human condition, including the ambiguities and paradoxes of man's predicament. As he says: "The Greek plays and *Job* presented a view of the universe, of man's destiny and his relations with his fellows and himself, in which evil, though not total, is real, ever threatening, and ineluctable. They explored the area of chaos in the human heart and its possibilities in the heavens." Out of human suffering so artistically formulated values are derived: "Suffering of this kind does more than prove man's capacity to endure and to perceive the ambiguity in his own nature and in the world about him." That suffering is seen to be positive and creative, leading to "a reordering of old values and the establishing of new."

As a transition from ancient to Renaissance tragedy, Sewall presents in a chapter entitled "Tragedy and Christianity" a closely reasoned statement concerning the impossibility of a genuinely Christian tragedy. He states the thesis of that chapter in the opening sentence: "In point of doctrine, Christianity

---

Mr. Heffner, Professor of Speech and Theatre, Indiana University, is the author of The Nature of Drama. *He was editor of* ETJ, *1954-1956, and associate editor of* QJS, *1948-1950.*

reverses the tragic view and makes tragedy impossible." Nevertheless, the whole Christian tradition profoundly affected Renaissance and later tragedy. The ways in which these effects operated are presented in his analyses of *Doctor Faustus* and *King Lear.* In the process of that analytical examination of the two plays he refers to various other English plays and compares the tragic conception of these with *Job* and with Greek tragedy. He sums up this conception in two statements at the conclusion of the discussion of *King Lear*: "The best that can be said is that human nature, in some of its manifestations, has transcended the destructive element and made notable salvage." But the play embodies tragic truth in another important way. The goods and bads may be shown as inseparable—that is, eternally present in all human actions and in the nature of the universe—but both are real (good as well as evil), and they are distinguishable."

Then follows a brief, interesting, and fruitful transitional chapter (Chapter 8), entitled "Tragedy and the Modern World." "After the English Renaissance and the tragic ambiguities of human passion and reason presented in Racine's plays, the next 'tragic moment' in western culture developed in the mid-nineteenth century." And that "tragic moment" expressed itself not in drama but in the novel. Various cultural forces in the eighteenth century, including the Enlightenment, made a truly tragic vision impossible until tragic dissents once again appeared in prose fiction around the mid-nineteenth-century era. As examples of these tragic novels he examines *The Scarlet Letter, Moby Dick,* and *The Brothers Karamazov.* In all of these, though in different ways, the tragic protagonists learn to know what suffering is and discover the limitations of their freedom. Hester Prynne suffers the abnegation of a Job and through her suffering attains a hard-won wisdom, which sustains her in the assertion of her own values. Ahab's plunge into the vortex, carrying all but Ishmael to destruction, by contrast is an ending that "forces to the limits any definition of tragedy comprehending positive values." "Like Job and Lear, he saw his own misfortunes as a sign of the common lot; and like them he struck back." Thus Sewall sees Melville's novel as a true tragedy that "goes deeply into the mysteries of all moral judgments." For at least one of the Brothers Karamazov, Alyosha, tragedy ends in bringing a reassuring certainty of a religious revelation. But the author asserts: "If the final scene is affirmative and restorative, it is hardly decisive. The clashing antinomies of the Karamazov world have not been resolved." Such new truth as the Brothers found, however, came through their tragic suffering.

To represent contemporary tragedy Sewall analyzes Faulkner's *Absalom, Absalom!* Prior to that analysis in another rewarding transitional chapter (Chapter 12), entitled "Dostoevski to Faulkner," he writes a brief but penetrating discussion of the modern arguments against the possibility of writing tragedy in the contemporary world. He examines Joseph Wood Krutch's statement propounded in 1929 in his essay, "The Tragic Fallacy," and then points out modern writers who have had, even though perhaps limited, something of a tragic vision of life. Against this background he examines the Faulkner novel, showing how Quentin, "like Ishmael, looked in the face of fire" and through his suffering comes to a kind of tragic discovery of human heroism, however ambiguous. This, says Sewall, takes Quentin barely through the stage of tragic initiation which in its shock has raised for him the question of the nature of man. In the organization of this story Quentin, unlike Hamlet, is never called upon to act; hence he is not carried beyond the terrors of a glimpse into the abyss.

Since the appearance of Nietzsche's *The Birth of Tragedy* in 1870-71, we have had an extensive series of works that may be said to deal with the philosophy of tragedy, tragic truth, the spirit of tragedy, or, as Sewall titles it, the vision of tragedy. Sewall knows these well and cites many of them. In his second footnote he give an extensive list of the books and throughout his footnotes cites many of the articles bearing upon the interpretation of tragedy. Sewall's study is probably the best of the recent works on this subject and is a rewarding work. It exhibits most of the virtues of the approach and some of the dangers. A well-formulated work of tragic art, like any great episode in human history, permits widely varying philosophical and other interpretations. Thus Francis Fergusson can interpret *Oedipus the King* as essentially a purification rite in which the scapegoat is sacrificed for the sake of cleansing and saving the city, the citizens, and hence mankind. Dr. Ernest Jones can interpret *Hamlet* as an elaborate exemplification of Freudian psychology, and Akimov, the Moscow director, can present it, as he did in 1936, as a Marxist document. These examples are obviously extreme and far removed from Sewall's approach but they do serve to illustrate that a great work of art is capable of saying many different things to different individuals. What the individual sees in the work will depend upon his point of view, his philosophical outlook; hence the approach exemplified by Sewall's book leads primarily to a revelation of an individual and personal philosophy which, as in Sewall's case, can become illuminating in its application to the interpretations of the "meanings" of various tragic works. Such an approach results in interpretations that are at one and the same time too broad and too restricted. They are too broad in their philosophical generalizations in that, to be complete, they require ultimately a total philosophy of life. They are too narrow in that they force divers forms of tragedy into a rather rigid philosophical mold, and in that they omit many of the effects of tragedy, especially tragedy written to be staged, which belong to the form and structure rather than to the philosophical assumptions and implications.

In his little book, *Racine and Poetic Tragedy,* Eugène Vinaver admirably illustrates the interpretative values that may obtain from an examination of specific tragedies in terms of form and structure. His arguments are solidly buttressed with facts and examples directly from the plays, whereas Sewall's interpretations depend in no small measure upon dialectical argument. Vinaver's prior work, *Principes de la Tragédie,* "extracted from Racine's marginal notes," forms a solid foundation for his *Racine and Poetic Tragedy.* The two should be read together. In the Introduction to the latter work the author succinctly establishes Racine within the tradition, the doctrine, and the practice, of the so-called "regular" theatre. The next chapter, "The Recovery of Pathos," brilliantly and concisely signals out in the beginning the major characteristics of the "heroic" drama so well represented by Corneille. As the author says: "The outstanding trait which distinguishes the 'regular' theatre from its supposed Greek model is the substitution in the spectator's mind of the interest of curiosity for emotion." Every ingenuity of criticism was employed to interpret the *Poetics* in terms of this conception of ends or function. D'Aubignac, along with other critics, held that, to paraphrase, all the pleasure of a play consists almost always in surprise and novelty; he along with his colleagues, once this idea was firmly established, could easily read portions of Aristotle's *Poetics* in confirmation without being conscious of wrenching the meaning. Corneille, alone among both poets and critics, realized that such interpretations raised most difficult questions about catharsis and went so far as to pose the question of whether purgation was ever really achieved through tragedy. It is through this examination of the catharsis of fear and pity that Racine was led to the recovery of tragic suffering and consequent pathos in his compositions. Herein lies his great originality among the playwrights of his age. It was not until the composition of *Andromaque,* however, that he really "set out on new roads." Nevertheless, his early plays, under the influence of Corneille, do have scenes and moments which anticipate his later direction.

Racine's probings of "pathos" and purgation raised for him problems and "discords" in the envisioning of his tragic characters and situations, and play by play he experimented with and invented "resolutions" of these. One of the first problems to be solved to attain his ends was that of prosody. Vinaver says: "he believes that tragedy has no use for the accessories which the Greek theatre had at its disposal: music, dance, song, decor. In the space, at once indeterminate and restricted, of the French classical stage, the dramatist's only task is to cultivate the essential resource of the theatre of all time: language." But the classical alexandrine was stiff, formal, and rhetorical, dispensing almost entirely with rhythm and harmony; hence more intellectual and astounding than emotional. One of Racine's glorious accomplishments is that he wrought out of this oratorical prosody a new tragic language of passion, suffering, and pathos. How he did this is fully revealed by Vinaver through analysis and quotation. He then proceeds to show how Racine made his "new" prosody a fitting instrument in the service of tragic reversal and tragic discovery.

Vinaver illuminates the major aspects of Racinian tragic construction and in so doing brings out significant interpretations of the plays, but in the whole process he never once loses sight of his central focus on tragic diction. His chapter on "Tragic Error" is a masterly explication of *hamartia* as employed by Racine, which brings new insight into Racine's tragic characters and their destinies, but which never strays from the central concern of the ways in which the language of tragedy is utilized to expose and make meaningfully effective the nature of the tragic error. Vinaver's book, therefore, is a model of organization and construction which, though it is not the central concern, reveals the way in which tragedy means as tragedy and as no other thing. There are philosophical ideas in abundance in the tragedies of Racine and many of these appear in the discussion, but the author is well aware that a tragedy has its own peculiar powers and effects and that these powers are not those of a philosophical treatise.

P. Mansell Jones has given us a splendid translation of Vinaver's little book, a task in which he acknowledges the very useful assistance of the author. A comparison with the earlier French text will reveal the admirable faithfulness of Jones' translation.

In the realm of comedy, as in that of

tragedy, two major approaches are exemplified in the scholarly investigations. At least since George Meredith's famous essay, *The Idea of Comedy and the Uses of the Comic Spirit,* first read to the London Institution in February, 1877, and since Henri Bergson's *Le Rire; de quoi rit-on?, porquoi rit-on?,* delivered as an academic lecture in 1884 and published as *Le Rire* in 1900, the almost exclusive preoccupation of investigators has been with the psychology of laughter or the philosophical explanations of the comic. Even such an historical study as Henry Ten Eyck Perry's valuable *Masters of Dramatic Comedy* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939) in addition to, or rather in connection with outlining the historic developments of comedy of the western world, is largely occupied with the idea of the comic or comic vision. An exception to this usual approach, however, is George E. Duckworth's splendid study of Plautus and Terence in his *The Nature of Roman Comedy, A Study in Popular Entertainment* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952) in which he probes the structure and techniques of Roman comedy. There are also several French studies of Molière that in approach are exceptions to the usual psychological or/and philosophical concern. In consequence, much of the important work on comedy as a form—its structure, techniques, and principles of organization—remains to be done.

For these reasons Jonas A. Barish's *Ben Jonson and the Language of Prose Comedy* is a valuable and welcome study. By way of introduction to his discussion of Jonson's uses of prose for comic purposes he traces the development of English prose style. In this he has been anticipated by and draws upon the works of Morris William Croll and many other investigators, but he adds significance to his summary by focusing upon the variety of ways in which prose evolved as a dramatic means. With analyses and quotations he differentiates clearly between the formal, oratorical, logical Ciceronian style and the nonlogical, freer baroque. Of the latter he says:

> In any event, baroque writers regarded Ciceronianism as an invitation to glibness and insincerity, and their first aim was to replace its logical schemes with various nonlogical maneuvers of their own, which Croll has grouped into the two categories of the "curt style" and the "loose style."

He shows how Shakespeare modified the stiff Ciceronian style into a subtle, flexible instrument of comedy.

From this general and adequate discussion of the evolution of English prose as a dramatic instrument, he turns to an equally complete examination of Jonson's development of baroque prose, showing how Jonson molded that style into a rich language for the representations of folly. He indicates the ways in which the playwright combined prose and verse in his early plays, a practice which he virtually abandoned after the composition of *Poetaster*. The discussion from this point on (Chapter IV and following chapters) is devoted to analyses of the variety of ways in which Jonson utilizes prose with masterly artistry as a means in the construction of comedy. In this examination he is forced to consider Jonson's "realism," its effects in the plays, and its function in the prose style. Nor does he shirk the obligation. As he says: "The triumph of prose as the language of comedy, and its convergence with realism, seem by hindsight an almost inevitable outcome of the history of the genre, perhaps the final issue of Aristotle's identification of comic style and comic characters as 'low.' "

The discussion of Jonsonian "realism" leads naturally to a consideration of the judicial and the satiric in his comedy. As Barish says: "But realistic comedy tends to be social, and social comedy tends to be critical." As the playwright turned more and more to the critical in comedy, his language begins to draw attention "not merely to its own agility and gusto, but to its own absurdity." He points out that in most playwrights who indulge in linguistic satire, and especially in Shakespeare, "we also find a firm backwall of linguistic normalcy." With Jonson, however, this ambivalence necessary to full comic effectiveness seemed impossible. "The language seemed to go on leading a life of its own, outside the conscious control of its maker. Something in Jonson insists on probing until it has exposed a layer of folly in everyone, in everything. Perhaps his vision was too absolutely comic to give him the widest scope even in comedy." These statements lead him into a brief consideration of Jonson's failures with prose, his neglect of at least two "linguistic modes" in prose comedy which were uncharacteristic of Jonson, and finally a brief glance at the relinquishment of prose and return to verse as a means of comedy after Jonson. He concludes by raising the question of Jonson's lack of popularity for more than a century and presenting some explanations for this neglect.

Barish has written a work that deserves to rank with such excellent studies in the other form as Moody E. Prior's *The Language of Tragedy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1947), which is probably the best modern study of tragic diction that we possess. It is to be hoped that Barish's study will generate others of its kind.

Any new book by the perceptive and prolific John Gassner is always welcome and his *Theatre at the Crossroads* is no exception. Like others of his works, it is stimulating, provocative, and contains a considerable amount of varied information. It illustrates yet another approach to the study of and writing about theatre and drama. Unlike the works so far discussed, it is not the result of minute, painstaking investigation nor is it an integrated, closely organized discussion focused upon a single subject. It is rather a collection of miscellaneous essays, some culled from lectures and previously published articles, ranging from examinations of such general subjects as tragedy in the contemporary age, the problems of production in the modern theatre, and analyses of individual playwrights, to specific reviews of individual plays seen in New York. As the author says in the first sentence of his Introduction: "This is an optimistic book." And he proceeds to give his reason for so saying: "Its argument is predicated upon a belief that the theatre is one of the few popular institutions still worth taking seriously." Many of the essays (e.g., "Eugene O'Neill: The Course of a Major Dramatist," "Tennessee Williams: 1940-60," "Jean Giraudoux as Virtuoso") are extensions and amplifications of previous treatments in one or several of his former books. All of them are essentially essays of opinion and interpretation. Such essays can, in the hands of a less well informed, less widely experienced writer, be extremely thin, superficial, and insignificant. With his informed mind and wide experience, Gassner brings to the writing of this book, as with his others, a solid common sense. As he says:

> Half a century of theatre and drama is a vast subject, and half a century of modern theatre and drama is an intimidating one. But the defense against intimidation is temerity, and the cure for confusion is simplification. I supply the temerity by asserting that there are no mysteries in modern theatre and drama that

> cannot be plumbed by informed common sense.

Valuable and stimulating as I find this book, which is the result throughout of the application of informed common sense to a half-century of theatre and drama, I would have to take issue with the last sentence in the above quotation. But then my point at issue might turn upon a semantic quibble over the word "mysteries" and the adjective "informed." Whether they are mysteries in the sense in which that word is used here or not, I could name a score or more problems concerning the modern drama and theatre whose solution requires considerably more than common sense. Space allows one example. Many critics have said that the almost exclusive restriction of modern drama to prose diction has denied modern dramatists the complete facilities of language and hence has robbed that drama of powers and effects characteristic of the drama free to utilize the whole range of verbal expression of passion, motivation, and human reactions. Yet no one thus far has written a companion work to Moody Prior's *The Language of Tragedy,* showing the full potentialities of prose as a vehicle of tragedy, nor has anyone done for a modern dramatist what Barish has so splendidly done for Ben Jonson. I might hastily add, however, that John Mills has underway a study of Shaw's comic diction. My reservation does not affect the former statement about Gassner's book but rather illustrates it. It is provocative and interesting, even when one may not fully agree with some of the opinions or conclusions.

Another intellectual pursuit to which scholars in the field of theatre and drama devote their attention is that of the making of texts and source books. Granted that some textbook making is little better than hack work—a utilization of scissors and paste rather than mind and experience—a good textbook by a competent scholar can be a considerable contribution. Such is Peter D. Arnott's *An Introduction to the Greek Theatre,* with a Foreword by that illuminating interpreter of Greek tragedy, H. D. F. Kitto. As Kitto says: "In writing this book Mr. Arnott has enjoyed enviable advantages and has made full use of them." His first advantage is that he is a well-trained and experienced classical scholar; his second and equally important advantage is that he is a highly-accomplished theatre man. While he was teaching in Great Britain, he developed a series of performances with puppets in order to make the Greek plays more vivid and living for his students. Eventually he presented these widely to the public and, since he joined the Department of Classics at the State University of Iowa, he has presented many performances of Greek and Elizabethan plays in various institutions, including the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington, D. C. In addition to synthesizing the best information available about the Greek theatre and its drama, he has presented, by way of illustrating the range of Greek drama, penetrating analyses of a number of Greek plays. I have used his book since it appeared and find it one of the most valuable aids in the teaching of Greek drama that is available.

Yet another approach to the study of drama is the biographical investigation of actor, director, or playwright. I have saved to the last the example of this approach, Croswell Bowen's *The Curse of the Misbegotten,* subtitled "A Tale of the House of O'Neill." On the title page and on the jacket the author acknowledges the assistance of Shane O'Neill, Eugene O'Neill's second son.

Bowen is a journalist by profession. His rather sensational title might lead one to expect a sensational treatment of his subject, for O'Neill's life did contain sensational episodes. Although he attempts to tell the whole story without concealment and, in so far as he could find its details from other writings on O'Neill and from a wide range of interviews and consultation with those who were connected with or knew the playwright, I do not think he has unduly sensationalized his report. His insistence, especially in his Preface, upon a "curse" hanging over the whole O'Neill family explains his title, is on the sensational side, and is to be accepted skeptically in any other than a metaphorical sense. Bowen has written his study in a popular style, which serves to make it interesting reading. So far as the facts and details of the playwright's life are concerned, this is the most complete account available within a single volume and to that extent is of value. Its great defect, and a very serious defect it is, is the complete lack of any significant analysis or interpretation of the O'Neill plays. The comment that he does make on each of the plays is of the most elementary kind, except in the instances in which he draws upon Winther, Engle, Skinner, and other critics better equipped than he is. Nevertheless, so far as the details of O'Neill's life are concerned this book apparently is factually accurate and is the kind of full report that Barrett Clark was not permitted to give in his brief life of O'Neill. The scholarly biographical study is, however, much better represented by Richard Moody's *Edwin Forrest: First Star of the American Stage,* reviewed by Jonathan Curvin in the October, 1960, issue of this journal.

BOOKS REVIEWED

THE VISION OF TRAGEDY. By Richard B. Sewall. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959; pp. xi+178. $4.00.

RACINE AND POETIC TRAGEDY. By Eugène Vinaver. (Translated from the French by P. Mansell Jones.) New York: Hill and Wang, 1959; pp. ix+143. $3.00.

BEN JONSON AND THE LANGUAGE OF PROSE COMEDY. By Jonas A. Barish. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960; pp. x+335. $5.00.

THEATRE AT THE CROSSROADS: PLAYS AND PLAYWRIGHTS OF THE MID-CENTURY AMERICAN STAGE. By John Gassner. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960; pp. xx+327. $5.95.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE GREEK THEATRE. By Peter D. Arnott. London: Macmillan; New York: St. Martin's Press, 1959; pp. xvi+240. $5.00.

THE CURSE OF THE MISBEGOTTEN: A TALE OF THE HOUSE OF O'NEILL. By Croswell Bowen with the assistance of Shane O'Neill. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959; pp. xix+386. $5.00.

THE LONDON STAGE, 1660-1800: A CALENDAR OF PLAYS, ENTERTAINMENTS & AFTERPIECES TOGETHER WITH CASTS, BOX-RECEIPTS AND CONTEMPORARY COMMENT COMPILED FROM THE PLAY-BILLS, NEWSPAPERS AND THEATRICAL DIARIES OF THE PERIOD. PART 2: 1700-1729. Edited with a Critical Introduction by Emmett L. Avery, Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1960; Volume I, ccxii+460; Volume II, xlii+461-1044. $50.00.

The first of a five-part series publication, *The London Stage, 1660-1800*, Professor Avery's *Part 2: 1700-1729* heralds the first comprehensive view of the London daily calendar since John Genest's ten-volume edition, *Some Account of the English Stage*. Since Genest's *Account* in 1832, scholars have made additions and corrections, published hand-lists of plays and performances, and provided excellent single studies of London drama and theatre, but no one has attempted a daily record in breadth of scope and fullness of detail that the current series promises students of the Restoration and eighteenth-century London.

Assuming that London playhouses were producers of entertainment rather than storehouses for playwrights, the editors plan to provide not only the basic ingredients of daily performances but also critical introductions covering varied aspects of theatrical management and play production. Drawing upon all available evidence in the great public and private collections, Avery's careful and delightful account of early eighteenth-century show business may indicate the range and detail of the whole work.

Comprising five-sixths of the two volumes, the calendar of performances has been organized as follows. First, the season is a self-contained unit, with entries arranged chronologically, introduced by a short note stating the chief actors in each company. The full cast (if known) is listed for the first performance, and references to the previous cast are made for successive performances. Compressing significant information into less space, Avery has provided an excellent "ladder" system of reference, useful for casts, songs, dances, and pieces of instrumental music. Second, the calendar includes every performance of spoken and musical drama (plays, operas, public concerts), but excludes puppets, pantomimes, entertainments of acrobatics, tumbling, and dancing not associated with a specific play or musical drama. Third, the entries are divided as follows: (1) the play and afterpiece (if any), including cast, prologue, or epilogue; (2) dancing, singing, music, and entertainments; (3) comment which includes benefits, requests for plays, box office receipts, presence of royalty, as well as "references to or quotations from contemporary documents which throw light upon the evening's whole entertainment." Consequently, the student as well as lay reader may visualize, according to the extent of available evidence, the whole performance including the prologue, mainpiece, entr'act, dances, entertainments, epilogue, afterpiece, and music.

In his critical Introduction, about 200 pages, Avery recounts the thirty-year story of London show business, centering on the "organization of the playhouses and the means by which they provided London with entertainment." He effectively describes theatre plants, financial and administrative matters, personnel, benefits, advertising, dancing, music, specialties, the seasonal program, audience, and the course of contemporary criticism. Although his Introduction clearly sets forth the scenic impact upon audience and manager, the reader may find comments on scenery too restrictive, with little or no discussion of types, methods of shifting, or the influence of scenery on the playwright. No reference has been made to Richard Southern's *Changeable Scenery,* and at one point in his essay, Avery lists scene designing under the general heading of *stage properties.* But this is carping, for the author has provided a remarkable stage history of early eighteenth-century London that may be noted for its thorough research, firm grasp, and clear vision.

Scheduled for completion within the next five years, and comprising about twelve volumes, *The London Stage, 1660-1800* will be published by parts in the following order: Part 3: 1729-1747, edited by Arthur H. Scouten, Pennsylvania; Part 4: 1747-1776, George Winchester Stone, Jr., New York University; Part 5: 1776-1800, C. Beecher Hogan, Yale; Part 1: 1660-1700, William van Lennep, Harvard. Beautifully bound in buckram and stamped in gold, each volume is approximately 700 pages in length and contains illustrations and an index. Brilliantly conceived, carefully planned, and singularly complete, *The London Stage, 1660-1800* may well provide the standard comprehensive reference, invaluable to students of intellectual and social history as well as theatre and drama.

EUGENE K. BRISTOW
Indiana University

THEATRE: THE REDISCOVERY OF STYLE.

By Michel Saint-Denis; Introduction by Sir Laurence Olivier. New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1960; pp. 110. $3.00.

This attractively presented series of talks by a distinguished international man of the theatre is less an analysis of style in general than the statement, restatement, and further restatement of his thesis that the "mud of naturalism" dominating today's theatre is a poor method for revealing the reality and truth of masterpieces as compared with methods of the classic theatre. The author, Michel Saint-Denis, who has spent a life-time directing, acting, and teaching in France and England and who possesses an intimate knowledge of the theatre in many other nations, declares that the aim of his work has always been "the discovery of all the means by which reality can be given to fiction on the stage." But it is a "deep realism" he seeks, one which expresses the "nature of things, the meaning of human life" and not the "mud of naturalism," i.e., a representation of the external and superficial aspects of existence. Such "deep realism" can be achieved, says Saint-Denis, only through style (not to be confused with stylization) which is defined as "the perceptible form that is taken by reality in revealing to us its true and inner character," and such style can be attained only by an understanding and mastery of the classic theatre of all periods.

An explanation of what the author means by classic theatre—with all its implications, ramifications, and revelations—forms the substance of these lectures, originally delivered in New York and at Harvard. The book is studded with revealing comments on every aspect of the theatre and contains much practical wisdom for both actors and directors. It is eminently readable. The style is graceful, direct, and conversational—as it should be in a series of informal lectures. When one finishes the book, he has shared the experiences and discoveries of a successful artist of the theatre; he has also sensed the warm and witty personality of the man.

GARFF B. WILSON
University of California, Berkeley

THE THEATRE OF BERTOLT BRECHT: A STUDY FROM EIGHT ASPECTS. By John Willett. New York: New Directions, 1959; pp. 272. $8.00.

Here, at long last, is a synthesis of all the fragmentary apologias for one of the twentieth century's most controversial playwrights, Bertolt Brecht. It should be welcomed by all who have ever come to grips with his drama in production.

In his initial section, "Analysis of the Plays," Mr. Willett summarizes plots, lists publication dates, and provides a series of abbreviated notes on productions and production personnel, composers, actors, directors, and designers.

The study of the playwright himself evolves as a kind of round dance beginning with Anglo-Saxon social and literary influences on Brecht and concluding with the Brechtian influences on Anglo-Saxon literature. The steps (executed through eight aspects: subject matter, language, theatrical influences, music, theatrical practice, theory, politics, and the English aspect) are interwoven in the development of Brecht as the political philosopher, dramatist, and theatre practitioner. The point is made that these three developments were inseparable.

Despite his introductory statement, "a proper estimate of Brecht's political position can only be given when the history of the German Democratic Republic is seen in better perspective and all Brecht's own political writings have been released," Mr. Willett demonstrates how Marxist dialectic formed the basis for Brecht's social philosophy and theatre aesthetic. The scientific attitude in the examination of society, the skepticism evidenced in the appraisal of social ethic or theatrical form, the concern with the downtrodden, the worker, even the language of his plays are all rooted in his political philosophy. Yet, little that he wrote "can be seen as specifically communist. If Brecht's politics make him suspect in the West, his literary originality gets him a hearing; if his aesthetics seem shaky in the East his political reputation gets him the benefit of the doubt." Brecht's style conflicted with communism's official nineteenth-century realism, and anyone familiar with his work recognizes a deep concern with the human situation that cuts across political and national boundaries.

Mr. Willett's excellent discussion of theatrical influence, practice, and theory should be of particular interest to those who have endeavored to produce Brecht. The author very sensibly points out that the epic process was Brecht's way of working and "it is a pity that Brecht allowed it to bulk quite so large in the public picture of himself and his work." He concludes by saying, "Once the novelty has gone the magic words have little real point. All that is essential in it [the epic process] is apparent from Brecht's own practice in the theatre and, to a producer of any intelligence, it must emerge still clearer from the actual plays."

In his concluding section, "The English Aspect," Willett notes the influence of Brecht on artists such as Wilder, Odets, Blitzstein, and Auden. But his major concern in this section is actually a criticism of the Anglo-Saxon artists who are "occupying themselves with trivialities, or simply going soft." He particularly laments the concentration "on style (or technique) to the point of affectation; they often go against the grain of our language by wrapping up their meaning or trying to pass off triviality as deep thought."

The Theatre of Bertolt Brecht is an example of that "communicative impulse" of which John Willett writes. It is rich in examples drawn from critical articles, Brecht's works, and pictures that advantageously adjoin the textual references. This book should be on every theatre library shelf.

WILLIAM E. KINZER
Indiana University

BRECHT: THE MAN AND HIS WORK. By Martin Esslin. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1960; pp. 360. $4.50.

To Americans who are forever erecting political, to say nothing of aesthetic, barricades around the theatre, Bertolt Brecht remains an enigma. This unreformed communist from the cacophonous German twenties and thirties, encumbered by outrageous theory and two day's growth of beard, found exile's succor neither in the American theatre nor the august halls of the House Un-American Affairs Committee. He came and did not conquer, leaving behind a popular song and a long run Off-Broadway musical. Brecht became the unknown in the small print who had something to do with Kurt Weill's excellent tunes or a bit of local color in the Koestler confessional, *The Invisible Writing*. To a degree, by the 1950's, the situation had changed. Through the efforts of Mr. Eric Bentley and company, Brecht's plays are known in translation—even state universities are producing them—and Brecht's dramatic theory has been bandied sufficiently to humbug more than one graduate committee.

In this atmosphere, Martin Esslin's excellent book is more than welcome. He assaults the barriers to Brecht, not with bombards and rockets, but with careful charm and quiet wit. There is a tendency apparent in criticism to consider those artists whose work is appreciated and whose politics is abhorred as somehow childlike and innocent; fortunately, in Esslin's case, there is no such attempt to characterize Brecht the man. Brecht emerges as a writer wise to the world of frontiers and hastily packed suitcases, given to Edwardian flim-flam and the "total untruth" when the occasion required. In his later years he made the best of two importunate worlds, living in East Berlin with a subsidized theatre at his disposal and a free road to the West, an Austrian passport in his valise.

Esslin's discussion of Brecht the artist is no less perceptive. Of particular value is his investigation into the sources and uses of the Brechtian inspiration and a clear exposition of Brecht's theatre aesthetic—a matter until now positively medieval and mysterious. Students will find the section listing and describing Brecht's output a stimulus for further work.

David Wiley
Longwood College

THE THEATER OF MARIVAUX. By Kenneth N. McKee, with an Appreciation by Jean-Louis Barrault. New York: New York University Press, 1958; pp. xvi+267. $5.00.

Kenneth N. McKee, Associate Professor of French at New York University, has assisted in clarifying our understanding of eighteenth-century France by revealing to a largely uninformed public the theatre of Marivaux. His book presents, in chronological order, descriptions of and critical comments on the thirty-one plays of Pierre Carlet de Chamblain de Marivaux (1688-1763). In doing so, he has carefully put into place a block hitherto missing to French and English scholars alike and has made it possible for many English and American students of limited bilingualism to gain a much clearer insight into a deserving French playwright and the society of his times.

Following a brief Introduction which places Marivaux in the schemata of French theatre, McKee allows a brief chapter to each of Marivaux's plays, telling the plot and adding what critical comments are available on the original performance and its revivals. McKee states in his Introduction that he makes no effort to resolve the many literary problems still unsolved in the world of Marivaux, and suggests several areas for further study. Other voids which become apparent as the panorama of Marivaux's theatre unfolds are the need for an exposition of the audiences who frequented the French and Italian theatres of the eighteenth century and their influence on the success or failure of Marivaux's comedies, and a clarification of the effect of the court on the philosophy of the theatre of the times. McKee points out that Marivaux's themes show evidence of the revolution that was soon to follow. "Making character the basis for evaluating merit implies social equality," notes McKee, and this theme in the plays may have made them more popular at the *Théâtre Italien* than they were at the *Théâtre Français*. Marivaux's concern with the education of women also shows his awareness of the problems of the society of his day.

McKee insists that Marivaux was the most original French dramatist of the eighteenth century. With both Racine and Molière dead and the tenor of France dominated by a frivolous and insipid court, the compliment loses some force. It seems preferable to say that Marivaux gave life and not a little breadth to the theatre of France during a period when French politics eliminated all but innuendo of reform from the media of public communication.

As Jean-Louis Barrault points out in his Appreciation, in revealing the talent of Marivaux, McKee has pointed with pride to *"l'ame et le coeur veritable due type 'francais.'"*

With the present need for understanding this *type*, we are indebted to Professor McKee and to the New York University Press for assisting with a clarification of a culture whose position in the contemporary world is of great importance to all.

PAUL D. BRANDES
Ohio University

A NEW VIEW OF CONGREVE'S WAY OF THE WORLD. By Paul and Miriam Mueschke. Ann Arbor, Mich.: The University of Michigan Press, 1958; pp. 85. Paper $3.00.

Teachers of dramatic literature and workers in the theatre will welcome this excellent analysis of Congreve's most brilliant work. All who read this treatise of the Mueschkes will return to *The Way of the World* with a fresh and stimulating insight into this great play. The central contention of the authors is that Congreve wrote a play with a profound moral message. "We propose," say the authors, "to show that it is the insight with which the progressive regeneration of one pair of adulterers is contrasted with the progressive degeneration of another pair of adulterers; that it is the artistry with which the balanced and antithetical form of wit is repeated in the balanced and antithetical intrigue and counterintrigue; that it is the ingenuity with which plot, character, and dialogue are integrated with the exposure of adultery; and that above all else, it is the depth, variety, and subtlety of the wit emanating from the repudiation of *carpe diem* philosophy which establishes the eminence of *The Way of the World* in the satiric tradition of Horace and Ben Jonson."

The Mueschkes have brought a great deal of learning and convincing logic to support their view, and in doing so have provided the reader with a fascinating analysis of a fine stage work. Many, however, like myself will cling to Meredith's view, "That the comedy has no idea in it, beyond the stale one that so the world goes. . . ." The authors have set as their task the moral rehabilitation of this Restoration comedy, and yet many will prefer it unreformed and willful. The thankless task of teachers is to seek means whereby we can present works of another age to students in such a way that what is timeless is not lost in the confusion of the differing customs and morals of other periods. What distresses students in Congreve is not his morals—for a generation nurtured on Tennessee Williams and Anouilh there is small shock here—but the brutal and calculatingly heartless manner in which the select few, Millimant and Mirabell, as well as the clods and "witwouds," treat those whom they consider to be inferior in wealth, birth, or wit. Of this the authors say nothing. To consider this work of Congreve's as a mere piece of baroque formalized wit is to strip it of its greatness; however, to search in it for morals which do not seem to most critics apparent is to give it a depth which makes sombre its true brilliance. To seek in a Restoration comedy the moral values of the late nineteenth century is to construct a critical anachronism. We can always find in a work of art what we have determined is there; we can find *marivaudage* in Ibsen and traces of Atellan farce in Sartre. This seems, however, to be doing it the hard way.

JAMES O. MORGAN
San Fernando Valley State College

THE SENSE OF HISTORY IN GREEK AND SHAKESPEAREAN DRAMA. By Tom F. Driver. New York: Columbia University Press, 1960; pp. viii+231. $5.50.

The main purpose of Mr. Driver's learned and intelligent book is to show that the differing senses of history in ancient Greece and Elizabethan England caused radical differences in form between Greek and Shakespearean drama. The argument is something like this: (1) the Greeks saw time as quantitative, circular, whereas the Jews and the Christians understood it as developing in accord with divine purpose; (2) "the form and quality of [dramatic] action will be known by the sense of time which informs it"; hence (3) Greek drama is relatively static and Shakespearean drama is relatively developmental. After introductory chapters on the historical consciousness, Mr. Driver compares four Greek with four Shakespearean plays. The critic opposes the Greek drama to the Shakespearean as follows: movement from event to knowledge vs. movement from knowledge to event, unchanging character vs. changing, imagery of space vs. imagery of time, closed time vs. open time.

The argument is well worth reading and is supported in detail, but it tends to exaggerate the differences between the Greeks and Shakespeare. In the contrast between *Macbeth* and *Oedipus Tyrannus*, for example, Macbeth is shown mainly as an evil man trying to substitute his time for God's time and meeting appropriate punishment, while Oedipus is treated as one destroyed as soon as one "lump" of time, the past, is handed to him in the present. The interpretation of *Macbeth* fails to acknowledge that despite Shakespeare's seeming religious orthodoxy, the evil Macbeth of Act V is a deeply impressive man still capable of indicating the tremendous range and power of human life. And if the emphasis on providential time in *Macbeth* tends to downgrade the hero, the view that time is closed in *Oedipus* undervalues the power of the Greek hero to think, act, and suffer. It is an overstatement to say that "Oedipus has the freedom . . . only to discover the past" (p. 167). It is his response to information that makes the play specifically dramatic. The tragedy continues for some hundreds of lines after the major discovery, and in the denouement the hero is free to stab out his own eyes, to assert that the act was his own, to demonstrate, indeed, his genius for suffering.

As Mr. Driver suggests, Aeschylus and Sophocles may have helped to sharpen the Greek sense of history. *Ars longa, historia brevis?*

WILLIAM G. MCCOLLOM
Western Reserve University

CHARLES MACKLIN: AN ACTOR'S LIFE. By William W. Appleton. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960; pp. x+280. $5.00.

Professor William Appleton of Columbia University has written more than a biography of an actor. He has given us a portrait of the world of the London and Dublin stage in the eighteenth century. Perhaps one might ask for more of the man, Macklin, and less of his environment. Nevertheless, when faced with the enormous task of re-creating the life of an actor who was overshadowed in his time by none other than David Garrick, the author had no choice than to use whatever material was available to him. Fortunately, Appleton did not stoop to fictionalizing when faced with limitations of sources. The result is 232 pages of substantial scholarship coupled with an interesting narrative of the famous actor, a story marred at times by the lack of source material rather than the author's ability to write.

The author's thesis is set down in the following manner: "Garrick unquestionably had more impact [upon his contemporaries], but genius has few followers, and Macklin as a teacher, in the long run perhaps had still more effect on acting style." In line with this precept, Appleton provides a most interesting chapter about Macklin's "naturalistic" school of acting and its contrast with the "formalistic" approach as practiced by Quin. The task is carried forth with relative ease, most difficult since the author had no access to the lost Macklin manuscript, "The Science of Acting."

Most of the pages are devoted to Macklin's irascible ninety years on the stage. Known primarily for his "demonic" portrayal of Shylock, Macklin also gained fame as the author of two well-known plays: *Love à la Mode* and *The Man of the World*. His role as a teacher was little known to his contemporaries, but it is in this category that Macklin may have had as much influence on the eighteenth-century style of acting as Garrick's own approach to realism.

Pity the lack of interest by Macklin's contemporaries, who were primarily taken up with the talents of Garrick; otherwise our present-day historians would have been left a rich heritage. Appleton deserves praise for bringing Macklin to our attention again. This first biography of the actor in seventy years is a welcome addition to the theatrical history of eighteenth-century England and Ireland, an age so sorely neglected by modern-day scholars.

MARVIN L. SEIGER
Hunter College

THEATRICAL ENTERTAINMENTS IN RURAL MISSOURI BEFORE THE CIVIL WAR. By Elbert R. Bowen. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1959; pp. xiii+141. $3.50.

Mr. Bowen has added another useful link to our growing understanding of the development of theatre and entertainment in America before 1860. All the principal cities from Boston to San Francisco have been subjects for major theatre treatments, but Mr. Bowen's work belongs to that smaller group of scholarly, factual, regional studies that follow theatre activities outside the major cities, in this case the country towns in northern Missouri—Hannibal, Boonville, Hermann, St. Joseph, and others. Frontier studies like Mr. Bowen's and those for Iowa, Texas, and Wisconsin (unpublished) not only provide detail about the movements of actors, construction of theatre buildings, and the spread of the theatre idea, but they also assist in our understanding of theatre in the much larger context of an emerging society. In rural Missouri, the actor appeared as soon as he could find enough people to make an audience—beginning in the 1820's, in full swing by the 1840's, at the peak in the 1850's before the sharp curtailment of the war years. We see this against a growing economy and a conventional moral pattern that, in its extreme, saw theatre as iniquity.

Entertainment is Mr. Bowen's larger subject: the travelling lecturer and exhibitions, wagon shows and circus boats, the minstrel show, the professional and amateur stage. The theatre historian will probably find the latter more useful. The itinerant professionals were usually little-known companies—Cargill's, Riley's, Newton's—but here, as we find elsewhere throughout the West, the Jeffersons also appeared as early as 1840. Stage fare was overwhelmingly British—*The Lady of Lyons, Rough Diamond, Irish Tutor, Douglas, The Golden Farmer*—and only rarely of American authorship. Entertainment for profit was the total purpose, and because of this the professional stage in Missouri has nothing to distinguish it from any small-town theatre of this period elsewhere in the country. Probably of more importance to the theatre historian is the flourishing amateur German theatre. Mr. Bowen's evidence for the town of Hermann should contribute further to the already extensive material recorded elsewhere about the early theatre activity of this national group in America that saw the stage, as it did music, as an essential to everyday life.

The most absorbing treatment to this reader is the fresh, well-documented account of the amateur theatre, with detailed emphasis on the community activity in Boonville. This aspect of a developing stage is usually treated superficially by regional theatre historians for lack of evidence, but Mr. Bowen has found a town that made amateur theatre its principal social activity and kept a written record of it. For seven years beginning in 1854 the Boonville group, under talented leadership, produced a wide variety of plays with all-male casts to a family audience, including children. Indeed, a theatre building, still standing, was constructed to house the group's activities. Boonville comes vividly alive in Mr. Bowen's telling as one of the earliest, if not the first, community theatres on the frontier, or elsewhere in the country for that matter.

The book is well documented (no index) with an extensive bibliography, particularly in local Missouri history and the German theatre in America. This study is certainly a useful factual tool for the American theatre scholar.

Francis Hodge
University of Texas

ON PLAYS, PLAYWRIGHTS, AND PLAYGOERS: SELECTIONS FROM THE LETTERS OF BOOTH TARKINGTON TO GEORGE C. TYLER AND JOHN PETER TOOHEY, 1918-1925. Edited by Alan S. Downer. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Library, 1959; pp. 100. $3.00.

This selected collection of Booth Tarkington letters to George C. Tyler and John Peter Toohey covers the seven years from 1918 to 1925. Because Mr. Tyler was a theatrical producer and Mr. Toohey a publicist for the producer, the letters are filled with "shop talk" concerning writing and rewriting, rehearsal plans, production, and critical reactions. Mr. Tarkington is revealed as a keen and earnest man, warm in his personal friendships, taking pleasure in his successes, and defending his failures until the last curtain.

The correspondence chronicles the early careers of Alfred Lunt and Helen Hayes whose potential as actors was fully recognized by Tarkington. He built plays around these young players, fashioning *Clarence* for Mr. Lunt and *The Wren* for Miss Hayes. They represented the hope of the new realistic theatre to Tarkington, who was intent on keeping pace with the turn from the romantic to the realistic style that came with the twenties.

Although Tarkington deplored much in the new realistic style of the theatre in the twenties he determined to keep pace with the trend. Actors like Miss Hayes and Mr. Lunt represented the sensitivity and creativity so necessary to the succesful interpretation of the new genre. Tarkington, therefore, found the actor and built the play around him. He even brought Miss Hayes to Kennebunkport where he could observe her manners and speech in detail. Once these were thoroughly familiar to him he completed the characterization and the play.

On Plays, Playwrights, and Playgoers is easy and stimulating reading. It gives a pleasant picture of the Hoosier playwright who is most often thought of as a novelist and back-fence philosopher.

Ross D. Smith
Purdue University

COSTUMING FOR THE THEATRE. By Josephine D. Paterek. New York: Crown Publishers, 1959; pp. x+150. $3.50.

Informal, direct, practical—such is the guide book Josephine D. Paterek provides for beginning costumers. The costumer is portrayed as seamstress, artist, student, teacher, actor, and lover of theatre who works "with pencil, needle and thread, pressing iron, imagination and love."

Following "The Costumer's Responsibility in Staging a Play," clues to costume information are revealed. Logical basis for unifying lines, color schemes, and selection of fabrics is furnished through a "costume organization plan." Charts relating costumes, make-up, and lighting are sufficiently detailed to interest experts, yet simple enough to aid neophytes.

Particularly interesting is the "costume timetable" by which basic requirements for period costumes are determined. The timetable is arranged chronologically, with drawings, beginning with the Egyptian era.

Perhaps most welcome to inexperienced workers is the explanation of actual construction of costumes, handled with clarity and vividness. Again, drawings are employed generously. Suggestions for equipping a costume workshop provide additional insurance for efficiency and effectiveness.

An eight-page supplementary reading list concludes the volume.

Because of down-to-earth content, simple style, and philosophical outlook, this book is recommended for direct use by college students and newcomers to theatrical costuming, and for "refresher" reading by experienced theatre personnel.

EDNA WEST
Northwestern State College of Louisiana

STAGE-SETTING FOR AMATEURS AND PROFESSIONALS. By Richard Southern. New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1960; pp. 272. $5.00.

Richard Southern is well-known for his books, technical and historical, which combine scholarly insight with common sense and practical experience. In each book his pen-and-ink sketches brilliantly supplement a literate prose. *Stage-Setting* fills a gap in current technical literature by treating excellently and at length what is usually relegated to a chapter on "minimum" scenery. Southern assumes that a simple platform rather than "full scenery covering the whole stage" behind a proscenium is the norm of scenic practice. He excludes "full scenery" from consideration because it necessarily involves the "inessential." "Stage-setting" refers only to that which provides mood and background. Southern discusses "background setting with no proscenium," the construction of a proscenium by simple means, the use of "pure curtain settings" behind a proscenium, and the combination of "background setting" with "essential" details. The book is admirable for clarity, for complete correlation of text and illustrations, for insistence that simplicity places a premium on careful planning, hard work, good taste, and imagination, and for the care with which technical descriptions are related to a parallel aesthetic discussion. Philosophy and *pratique* combine to lift the book above the ordinary "how-to" handbook.

ROBERT H. HETHMON
University of Wisconsin

CHILDREN'S THEATRE: PLAY PRODUCTION FOR THE CHILD AUDIENCE. By Jed H. Davis and Mary Jane Watkins with the collaboration of Roger M. Busfield, Jr. New York: Harper, 1960; pp. xiv+416. $6.00.

One sign that a growing profession has reached maturity may be the emergence, from a number of textbooks, of a single volume that eventually becomes accepted as the classic in its field. The children's theatre profession has awaited such a classic for too many years. One is tempted to predict that this is it.

Professors Davis and Watkins cover a lot of ground: the history and philosophy of the modern children's theatre, child audiences, and the individual problems of the director, playwright, actor, designer, and business manager. Some excellent production photos, sample prompt pages and light plots, and a tabulation of 120 children's plays are included.

When child casts call for specialized techniques, the techniques are described in terms of *how* and *why*. The point is made, however, that the artistically ideal cast for the children's play has children in youthful roles and adults in mature roles.

In their Preface, the authors take a stand for "strongly directed" theatre for children, and suggest that this stand is a "controversial" one. As regards both method and theory, however, readers will find the text to be sound. They may, in fact, wish to adopt *in toto* all of the professional standards which the authors advocate (pp. 294-295) for children's theatre:

> 1. It is recognized as on equal status with adult theatre programs. No theatre program is complete without the production of children's plays—but these should never be considered the season's "filler."
>
> 2. Those in charge of children's theatre

programs respect their work. No one can do even a passable job while maintaining an attitude of condescension.

3. Directors are thoroughly trained in this specialized branch of theatrical production. An increasing number of colleges and universities must offer practical and theoretical training in child drama to outstanding candidates for the new professional children's theatre; those chosen to implement such training programs must themselves be specially trained.

4. Children's theatre workers place a high value on their services. Children's theatre is not second-rate theatre, and highly trained directors must be recognized as equal to their counterparts in adult theatre and worth equal salaries in every type of organization.

Now who will take issue with *that!*

ROBERT CHAMBERS
Oakland Recreation Department

EDUCATIONAL THEATRE JOURNAL, A TEN-YEAR INDEX: *1949-1958.* By David Welker. East Lansing, Mich.: American Educational Theatre Association, 1960; pp. 84. $3.00 (AETA members, $2.00).

DIRECTORY OF AMERICAN COLLEGE THEATRE. Edited by Burnet M. Hobgood. East Lansing, Mich.: AETA, 1960; pp. 64. $3.00 (AETA members, $2.00).

Here are two paper-bound reference sources of tremendous value to students of educational theatre. The first will retain its usefulness; the second will require revision at regular intervals.

The Educational Theatre Journal, A Ten-Year Index; 1949-1958 is a supplement and cross reference, printed in the same clear type and format as the parent publication. Editor David Welker must be commended for the skill with which he has planned a single, neatly compact, and detailed index to ten years of publication.

Articles and reviews are entered by author, title, and at least one subject matter heading. Special abbreviations show when an article contains illustrations, quotations, lists, material in tabular form, or a bibliography. AETA committees, conventions, "News," and "Reports" are included in the index. Subject headings, and sub-headings, are in bold face type to insure a quick recognition of the organizational plan. Frequent reference to related headings, and *"see also"* entries, give the index a completeness characteristic of professional workmanship. Some fifty entries were checked by this reviewer without finding a clerical error.

The *Directory of American College Theatre* is a first attempt to organize over 30,000 items of information about the theatre programs in 1,457 American colleges and universities. Information was compiled during 1959. The form of the directory was derived from the *College Blue Book*; the system of numbering institutions was retained in the directory so that additional information can be easily obtained.

Section I of the directory tabulates information on the undergraduate theatre programs. Section II provides the same basic information for graduate programs. Both sections contain a supplementary unit on non-tabulated data: Section I lists theatre course titles; Section II provides a detailed statement of financial aid.

Data are systematized under the names of colleges within each state; the department and chairman; address for contact; total enrollment; institutional control or affiliation; name of the theatre club; types of theatre courses offered; number of faculty and students; financial aid to students; and membership in related associations.

Much of the information has been highly coded to stay within reasonable space limitations on the 9 x 11 page. Codes are adequately explained; the print is small but clearly readable.

College enrollments and theatre programs change slightly each year. Although some of the information is already out-dated, the comparative study of programs will remain of interest. The directory presents a significant picture of the American educational theatre in 1959.

M. BLAIR HART
University of Arkansas

THE POWERS OF POETRY. By Gilbert Highet. New York: Oxford University Press, 1960; pp. xv+365. $6.00.

Professor Highet's opening paragraph will appeal to oral interpreters: "A good poem has many different approaches, and many different methods of exerting power over its readers. Or should we say—over its readers, speakers and hearers? We lose a great deal nowadays because we seldom read poems aloud, even to ourselves. Yet most poems in the enormous treasury of the world were meant to be spoken, or chanted in chorus, or sung to music. Much of their meaning is in their sound."

This approach to poetry he keeps constantly in mind. However, his first illustration of the powers of sound in poetry is unfortunate, for he attempts, as so many critics have done, to show that "various letters have quite different emotional connotations—*s* shows hatred," etc. What hatred, one wonders, is shown in *s*oft *s*obs and *s*oulful *s*ighs? And "The letter *f* is quiet, almost mute, like a tiny breeze blowing." One *f*rightful, *f*rantic, *f*urious *f*rown *f*inishes that.

But the chapters that follow, thirty-eight of them, on poets and poems, are a constant delight, full of rare insights, surprising suggestions and brilliant illuminations. The author ranges with modest erudite ease from Anacreon to the moderns, and through half a dozen languages, but always he carries the reader with him, for these are not formal essays, but rather familiar talks. There is no attempt at systematic development of a theory or theme. Each chapter is complete in itself, and its subject may be whatever strikes his fancy—Shakespeare in Italy, poems on insects, the death of Shelley, Eliot's *Waste Land* as a dramatic poem, and always his treatment throws a revealing light on the nature and the "powers" of poetry. The style is uniformly simple, clear, and colloquial, entirely free from dogmatism or critical jargon, the style of a brilliant lover of poetry conversing with his friends. Many poems, familiar and unfamiliar, are quoted, in whole or in part, and he must be dull indeed who can read these illuminating comments on them without profit and delight. There is an excellent summary chapter on the uses of poetry, and there is an Index.

W. M. PARRISH
University of Illinois, Emeritus

NAMING-DAY IN EDEN: THE CREATION AND RECREATION OF LANGUAGE. By Noah Jonathan Jacobs. New York: Macmillan, 1958; pp. xi+159. $3.95.

Accept this book as recreation (as its subtitle says, but which, in its ambiguous phrasing, it does not appear to mean), and there is slight chance that you will not be successively delighted, impressed, well-informed, and yet just sufficiently piqued. Here is a philological chrestomathy of lexicographical bonbons, etymological tidbits, and semasiological goodies that makes for one of the most urbanely cultured, absorbingly interesting, and entirely fascinating books you have ever had the good fortune to come across. The onolatry of certain theriophilists; the sesquipedalian orthography of Welsh villages; profane transcriptions of the Tetragrammaton; Theodoric's skill at technopaegnia; Scotch fiddles, Turkish medals, and, among many others, the sage observation that "though man shares with the animals only his body but not his soul, it remained for our age to seek the clue to his essence in the behavior of rats in mazes and in the tropisms of plant lice," are but a sampling of what there is here to be savored. This labor for the love of words deserves a place on the list of appropriate bread-and-butter gifts for mine weekend host as well as on the shelf of the serious student of speech and language.

The book's title is derived from "the symbolism of that mighty myth" recorded in the second chapter of Genesis, "and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof." And though he has produced a tapestry lovingly (and joyfully) woven out of the web of words with which man has festooned God's earth, the author is no mere amateur (Lat. *amator*, lover). As well versed in language lore as in linguistic science, the author is obviously a scholarly gentleman, more than merely well acquainted with the sound, sense, and substance of the phenomenon, whose own linguistic abilities continually prove equal to his subject. Carlyle, we are told, for instance, described Emerson as "'a gap-toothed and hoary ape,'" protesting that he was using "language of the strictest reserve" in so doing!

It is, then, more than mere cavil to mention the danger of confusing language lore with linguistic law. Sound alone, we are told, for instance, is "an unreliable vehicle for thought" (a disputable point!). It "beguiles the ear without engaging the mind." And yet on occasion (admittedly infrequent, thank goodness!), it appears as though the subject beguiles the author's mind without engaging his ear. "Some animals," we are told, for instance, "notably the white cat (if it has blue eyes), are stone deaf." Yet we are inclined to forgive; for it cannot be denied that like his indomitable First Ancestor, our author, too, is *homo nascitur poeta*, man born poet; as Cervantes said, "There is a thing called poetical license."

Anyone tired of those countless learned works dealing with the structure and classification of languages, their connections and points of divergence, their morphology and changing phonetic systems, which "often appear on poor paper with narrow margins and, what is worse, in German" (or its confusing equivalent, whether natural or artificial), anyone frightened off by "the jargon of these joyless tomes," yet still interested in or concerned with the age-old struggle of man with language, the place that language occupies in the various philosophical systems, its relation to rhetoric, and its affiliations with religion, will find in this volume, erected, it is true, on a slender (but solid) foundation, a missal worthy of the name.

JOHN B. NEWMAN
Queens College

EDMUND BURKE AND IRELAND. By Thomas H. D. Mahoney. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960; pp. xvi+413. $7.50.

New Burke studies continue to appear with remarkable frequency. This one, by Professor Mahoney of the Department of Humanities at M.I.T., provides a full narrative account of Burke's activity touching Ireland, including ample summaries of all that Burke said and wrote on Irish affairs. In its detailed, painstaking, comprehensive, abundantly-documented treatment of the material, including the great accretion of new source material of the past dozen years, it convinces a reader that no relevant data have been overlooked, and that the author has viewed the evidence thoroughly and sympathetically. Hence, unlike some previous treatments of the subject, this is neither Irish Nationalist propaganda nor Roman Catholic apologetics. It is, in effect, a biography of the orator-statesman, excerpted to feature his intermittent but life-long attention to the welfare of his native land and of the religion (though not his own) of the great mass of his countrymen.

The narrow concentration on Burke, however, and on those such as Portland, Fitzwilliam, and Burke's son Richard who were immediately under his influence, dictated, no doubt, by the limits of space, seems to prohibit adequate presentation of the broader context of the questions of Ireland and Catholicism which would illumine fully Burke's significance in a confused and vexed situation. The reader sees the situation almost entirely through Burke's eyes, which are somewhat less than clear when they look, for example, at Grattan and the Irish Volunteers.

For similar reasons, the place of Ireland and the Catholics in the whole compass of Burke's activity tends to slip out of focus, except, for example, in the discussion of the end of his term as member for Bristol. There Burke himself provided a synthesis in his great speech justifying his conduct, a speech which Mahoney admires highly and summarizes judiciously. In his final chapter, "Retrospect," Mahoney explicitly recognizes these relationships, though in the body of the book only glimpses of them come to the surface: "There can be little doubt," he writes, "that the most important motivating force behind Burke's work for Ireland was the great attachment which he had formed for the British Empire. . . . The parts of the empire had to be strong and content, if the whole were to be powerful" (p. 312).

Though we may protest that the part is never the whole, we may agree readily that the book may stand on its own feet as a substantial amplification and corrective to the understanding of that public concern of Burke which, though not primary in his career, had the longest duration and touched him more closely than most. Mahoney has not exposed essentially new facets of Burke as a thinker, a writer, a speaker, a practical politician, a patriot, or a humanitarian. He gives his reader, however, a new sense of the depth of Burke's knowledge and the intimacy and detail of his involvement in even the secondary causes which he undertook.

Summaries and excerpts of the penal laws against Catholics and of the chief relief acts which were at issue during Burke's life, comments on sources and selected bibliography, ample notes, and an Index occupy the last ninety pages.

DONALD C. BRYANT
University of Iowa

STUDIES IN AMERICAN CULTURE: DOMINANT IDEAS AND IMAGES. Edited by Joseph J. Kwiat and Mary C. Turpie. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1960; pp. viii+233. $4.75.

Planned, in part, as a *Festschrift* for Tremaine McDowell, former chairman of the Program in American Studies at the University of Minnesota, 1945-1958, this collection of essays by participants in the American Studies movement is designed to give a "sense of the directions that work in the general field of American culture has been taking within the last decade or so." Fifteen essays by sixteen contributors, representing various specialties such as literary history and criticism, social, intellectual, and aesthetic history, and political, economic and social theory comprise the volume. A leading question is posed by Henry Nash Smith in an opening essay: "Can 'American Studies' Develop a Method?" Believing that the problem of method for American Studies is "bound up with an effort to resolve the dilemma posed by the dualism which separates social facts from aesthetic facts," Smith concludes that "no ready-made method for American Studies is in sight." Methods of analysis deriving from literary critics and from the social sciences exhibit "each in its own way, serious shortcomings from the standpoint of understanding American culture as a whole." In a note of optimism, Smith hopefully remarks that "inquiries which have their starting points in various academic departments can converge as they are brought to bear upon a single topic, namely, American culture past and present."

The essays range over a wide variety of subjects, including such topics as "How Americans See Themselves," "The Meaning of Lindbergh's Flight," and "Henry Adams and the Culture of Science." Four essays are unified by the fact that they seek in historical and social data the evidences for cultural definition. The other essays proceed from a base in literature and the other arts rather than from one in history and the social sciences.

The student of rhetoric and public address, long interested in "case studies" focusing on individual speakers and speaking occasions, will find sanction in the essays for emphasis on the particular. He will also doubtless find both provocative and rewarding the essay by Allen Tate, "A Southern Mode of the Imagination," which employs the tools of rhetoric and dialectic to explore the nature of Southern literature.

Marie Hochmuth Nichols
University of Illinois

CENTURY OF STRUGGLE: THE WOMAN'S RIGHTS MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES. By Eleanor Flexner. Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1959; pp. xiv+384. $6.00.

Miss Flexner's handsomely illustrated and well-documented study is based on monumental research. She has interviewed women who took part in the woman's rights movement; she has examined scores of books, newspapers, magazines, reports, proceedings, papers, letters, theses, and speeches. She has investigated materials in many libraries and private collections.

In her Preface, Miss Flexner opines that women have been a more significant factor in the development of the United States than historians have generally acknowledged them to be. Her work may persuade future writers of history to give greater attention to the achievements of women, but it has more immediate values than this doubtful possibility.

A significant contribution is the indication of relationships among changes taking place in various areas in the last century. Miss Flexner makes it clear that the struggle of women for human dignity was concerned not only with suffrage, but with education, labor, and social reform. She shows that the struggle for women's rights received impetus from the same forces that brought about emancipation of the slaves, industrialization, and international responsibilities. She tells how the National and the American Associations for Woman Suffrage and the Congressional Union each contributed to the long effort to enfranchise women. Her insights into the forces opposing the voting privilege for women make interesting reading; and the brewers, women who opposed their own enfranchisement, southern senators who feared the overthrow of the Jim Crow system, certain business interests, the political machines, and Senators Lodge, Reed, and Borah emerge as the villains or heroes of the struggle, according to the reader's prejudices.

Miss Flexner's account of the intellectual progress of women is more briefly, but no less skillfully drawn than her story of the suffrage movement. The early efforts for recognition of women wage earners is also carefully documented and lucidly written.

Her narrative includes stories of such well known women as Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, Lucy Stone, the Grimké sisters, Ernestine Rose, Margaret Fuller, and Lucretia Mott. She has also given vivid accounts of dozens of less well known women who contributed to the progress of their sex, such as Mrs. Esther Morris, the first woman justice of the peace on record, and Sarah Bagley, leader in the Female Labor Reform Association.

Excluding a bias for Susan Anthony, which extends to labeling the proposal for Constitutional amendment as the Susan B. Anthony amendment, Miss Flexner writes with objectivity. She generally writes with vigor, imbuing her story with excitement save for passages where too many names of little-known women are included. In her first chapter, "The Position of American Women up to 1800," she attempts to cover so many areas that the sections lack coherence, but her weaknesses are relatively minor ones.

References to speaking, though incidental, are none the less significant. For example, Frances Willard's report of an interview with one of the women speakers for the labor movement furnishes a comment on preparation. "How do you speak to them?" Miss Willard says she asked. "Oh, just as I do to my children at home," the woman answered. "I have no time to get anything ready to say, for I do and always have done, all my own work, but I just talk as well as I can at the time." Miss Flexner's work offers convincing evidence that speaking was a considerable factor in the progress of women, and in her account eloquence and effectiveness are often synonymous. Within this book are implications for numerous studies in public address. Moreover, the footnotes often indicate where materials for such studies might be found.

FRANCES L. MCCURDY
University of Missouri

LINCOLN'S PLAN OF RECONSTRUCTION. By William B. Hesseltine. Tuscaloosa, Alabama: Confederate Publishing Company, 1960; pp. 154. Paper $4.00.

This provocative monograph, Number Thirteen in Confederate Centennial Studies, projects the concept that Lincoln waged a "War against the States," thereby destroying their rights and powers and concentrating authority in the national government. "Each of his plans, his programs, and his processes," says William B. Hesseltine, "had looked toward making the seceded states into subordinate parts of a sovereign and centralized nation." The Civil War thus ended the old Union and "made imperative the attempt to remodel Southern life in conformity with the national model."

In the course of his lively discussion, Professor Hesseltine analyses each of Lincoln's experimental programs for the reconstruction of the South and concludes that for one reason or another each failed. Although claiming to follow Lincoln's course, Andrew Johnson actually proceeded along the lines prescribed by the Wade-Davis Bill. In contrasting Lincoln's pragmatic policy with Johnson's inflexible adherence to this preconceived course, the author concludes that "John Wilkes Booth's bullet found Abraham Lincoln without a plan of reconstruction."

Although ostensibly about reconstruction, the monograph is, in fact, an interpretation of the War's causes. "Reconstruction was," according to Hesseltine, "the basic issue of the Civil War. The desire to re-make the South, to reorganize its social system, to bring its divergent economy into the main stream of American life, to impose peculiar concepts of government and of constitutional interpretation upon the Southern states had been the reason for beginning the war and for prosecuting it with vigor, despite tremendous losses in human life and costs in national wealth."

Students of public address and propaganda should avail themselves of the works in this distinguished series, though some, alas, are already out of print. Included among its authors are E. Merton Coulter, Jay Monaghan, William Stanley Hoole, Thomas D. Clark, and Clement Eaton. Of particular interest are Weymoth T. Jordan's *Rebels in the Making: Planters' Conventions and Southern Propaganda,* James W. Silver's *Confederate Morale and Church Propaganda* (out of print), and Silver's forthcoming *Confederate Morale and Newspaper Propaganda.*

R. G. G.

THE TRUMPET SOUNDETH: WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN AND HIS DEMOCRACY, 1896-1912. By Paul W. Glad. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1960; pp. xiv+242. $4.75.

In recent years popular writers and historians have been harsh in their treatment of William Jennings Bryan. They remember only his last years. They are likely to emphasize his fundamentalist lectures, his inability as the Secretary of State to understand or to deal with the beginnings of World War I, and the activities during his Florida retirement, namely his Tourist Bible Class in the Royal Palm Park in Miami, his work with Florida real estate interests, his prohibition lectures, and of course the famous Scopes trial. In the light of present attitudes, the great Commoner seems inconsistent, inept, anti-intellectual and at times even demagogic. The now popular play and movie, *Inherit the Wind,* grows out of these attitudes.

There is another phase of the career of the Nebraskan, and the present book analyzes it. The author attempts to see his subject in the context of the years from 1896 to 1912 when Bryan's influence was great. He considers Bryan's leadership of the Democratic party and his role as a "leader of the opposition." Concerning the latter, the author says, "If there is value in such opposition (and Bryan believed there was), then he must be credited with an important contribution to American life. The significance of this contribution is the subject of the present investigation."

The author shows the sources of Bryan's ideas and contentions. He presents Bryan as a true son of the Middle Border and as a prophet of its faith. He shows that at the heart of Bryan's political and social philosophy was a "moralism derived from American Protestant Christianity." Bryan was significantly influenced by revivalistic religion, the McGuffey reader, a conservative home, the circuit Chautauqua, and agrarian unrest. This background equipped him well to speak for the farmer and laborer who thought as he did and who found themselves in conflict with bankers and industrialists. The Nebraskan said eloquently what millions of his compatriots wanted said; he said it the way they would have said it if they had possessed his gift and his feeling for words.

The book analyzes, largely through a consideration of his speeches, Bryan's stand on free silver, imperialism, tariff, direct election of senators, prohibition, public ownership, and immigration. It further considers his role in the Progressive movement as well as his leadership of his party. During his three tries for the Presidency, he held fast to his ideals. In summary the author says, "His political and economic views had been shaped by the moralism of the Middle Border, and he had displayed remarkable consistency in adhering to those views. He had labored—for the most part successfully—to have his ideals, his analysis of shortcomings in American life, and his remedies adopted by the Democracy. He had seen many of his proposals enacted into law." In fact he saw many of them accepted and enacted by the opposition. Glad believes that during the period of his prominence "the tone of American political life . . . changed immeasurably and Bryan was to an extent responsible for that change."

The book is well documented and thoughtfully written. At times the reviewer found the style tedious and unimaginative. Nevertheless, the book is valuable in its attempt to put Bryan back into context and to suggest that he was much like millions of Americans during the first decade of the century. The author has viewed Bryan in the perspective of the times in which he lived and of the causes for which he fought. Herein is probably the contribution of the book. It is favorable to the Nebraskan in that it rights the record, but in the judgment of the present reviewer it is objective and analytical in its approach.

WALDO W. BRADEN
Louisiana State University

MOTION PICTURES: THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN ART FROM SILENT FILMS TO THE AGE OF TELEVISION. By A. R. Fulton. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1960; pp. xv+320. $5.00.

In reading the first eight of the sixteen chapters of *Motion Pictures,* I thought I had at last found a satisfactory textbook for my course in screen appreciation. In Chapter 1, "The Machine," Professor Fulton narrates the evolution of the motion picture camera and projector, skillfully avoiding the extremes of oversimplification and inordinate detail. "'Arranged Scenes,'" Chapter 2, is an excellent account of George Méliès' innovations. In the next six chapters, Professor Fulton concisely and interestingly expounds the historical and aesthetic significance of such men and films as Edwin S. Porter, Sarah Bernhardt's *Queen Elizabeth,* David Wark Griffith, *The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari,* Erich von Stroheim's *Greed,* and Sergei M. Eisenstein. Each of these chapters assumes that its reader knows about the screen and its history only what he might have learned before his television set or in his neighborhood theatre. Although the exposition seems to be addressed to the entering freshman, rather than to an upperclassman or a graduate student, its admirable clarity more than compensates for its possibly overdone simplicity.

In "Sound," Chapter 9, there is a sudden shift in focus. Possibly the author realized that his deadline was nearing, or perhaps his publisher had rigorously limited the length of the book. Now we must read more between the lines than there is in them. The exposition suddenly becomes, not superficial, but elliptical. He ceases to address the beginner in film study, and begins to communicate (almost telegraphically) with his peers, for whom a title, a "still," or the description of a sequence suffices to evoke a host of recollections of a film familiar from repeated viewing.

Succeeding chapters become shorter and shorter (exclusive of illustrative citations) until eventually they seem to be notes to be amplified into chapters, rather than the chapters themselves. This dwindling would not be so regrettable if it were not that the first half of the book is a synthesis of the content of fairly accessible sources and the latter half is Professor Fulton's original contribution, which he develops hardly at all. Yet despite their sparseness (for all the world like notes which a teacher would elaborate in a classroom lecture), these chapters manage to say more about the adaptation of plays, novels, and short stories for the screen than some volumes do.

Giving us the forepart of one book and the hindquarters of another is the one genuine flaw in *Motion Pictures*. Its real and potential excellences make its minor faults and inaccuracies seem to be greater in both number and importance than they actually are.

HENRY L. MUELLER
University of Illinois

THE DYNAMICS OF DISCUSSION. By Dean C. Barnlund and Franklyn S. Haiman. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1960; pp. xviii+461. $4.50.

This analysis of the processes of group discussion, experimental in approach, rich in texture, has five major parts: "The Setting of Discussion," "Group Thinking," "Interpersonal Relations," "Leadership," and "Discussion in the Modern World." Three appendices pertain to "Learning to Discuss."

Declaring that the discussion process does not lend itself to "pat answers or pat rules" for handling problems arising in the thinking, interpersonal relations, or leadership of a group, the authors seek to develop the reader's awareness of issues, their values, and alternative ways of handling them. For example, they present conflicting views on the expression of *values* as a separate step in problem solving, and leave the decision to the reader. After describing several styles of leadership, the authors recommend that the reader "experiment" with different methods of sharing leadership effectively with the group. And they recommend that students "participate in and help shape their own course of instruction." The book is truly experimental in philosophy and pedagogy.

The Dynamics of Discussion is a rich book. No mere listing of major sections can give indication of the wealth of experience brought to bear upon the issues, and the breadth of scholarship drawn upon in areas relevant to these issues. Experience speaks in the eloquent chapter on "The Uses and Abuses of Discussion" and in the explanation of group norms. The book abounds in use of corroborative and illustrative materials from a wide range of sources. The reader meets apt words from Judge Learned Hand, Bales, Korzybski, Dewey, Lippmann, Homans—from more than two hundred persons of renown.

Participating in the spirit of the book, this reviewer suggests that she would like to see more extended treatment of intellectual factors in group thinking, greater emphasis on tentativeness of viewpoint in the group, careful analysis of the influence of reference group membership, and a full explanation of functioning appropriate for the "leader in reserve."

Supplemented on these points from other sources, this text provides a valuable and delightful basis for training in the "art of discussion." A book of this caliber is of high credit to the men who produced it and to the discipline in which they work.

LAURA CROWELL
University of Washington

FIRST PRINCIPLES OF PUBLIC SPEAKING. By Loren Reid. Columbia, Mo.: Artcraft Press, 1960; pp. xvi+342. $5.00.

Why consider this text for an introductory course in public speaking? Well, we might infer from the writer's long teaching career that the book would be comprehensive in scope and sound in theoretical underpinning. Or, on the basis of his previous writings and speeches, we would look forward to a lively, interesting style. And from the author of a leading text on the teaching of speech (now in its third edition), we would anticipate a book conceived and written with the student steadily in mind.

Professor Reid amply fulfills our expectations. There is at least one important additional feature of his new book, moreover, which we probably would not divine. From a great many speakers active in government, education, religion, and business, the writer solicited testimony as to habits of preparation and delivery. By drawing generously on this material for illustration and documentation, he has produced a book which spans the gap between classroom and non-classroom more effectively than most.

One reservation, apparently a minority report: in common with most of the introductory texts now in print, *First Principles of Public Speaking* does not sufficiently encourage students to broaden their interest in and understanding of the problems which trouble our society and with which the important speeches of every generation are concerned. Both the subjects suggested and the general approach to substance foster insignificant, narrowly personal speeches. "My Summer Job" and "New Developments in Compact Cars" may be easy topics for students to handle, but to this reviewer they seem to offer poor material for instruction in speechmaking because they are so simple, and poor material for education because they are so inconsequential.

Harry P. Kerr
Harvard University

MODERN DEBATE: ITS LOGIC AND STRATEGY. By Arthur N. Kruger. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960; pp. x+448. $6.50.

INTRODUCING CONTEST DEBATE. By Harold Dressel; Illustrations by Eleanor Woolfe. Flint, Mich.: Mott Foundation, 1959; pp. 47. Paper $0.50.

Basing his book on the premise that intercollegiate debate is perhaps the most valuable discipline in a curriculum, Arthur N. Kruger, Professor of English and Speech at Wilkes College, Pennsylvania, divides *Modern Debate* into six major parts: Part One, Introduction (which sets forth the author's philosophy of academic debate); Part Two, Analysis and Development; Part Three, Attack and Defense; Part Four, Presentation (language and delivery); Part Five, The Case in Action; Part Six, Special Problems (in judging, coaching, etc.).

The text's liberal sprinkling of realistic illustrations, its emphasis on direct clash, its intellectually stimulating exercises, its penetrating discourse on logic in the context of debate, and its microscopic criticism of the handling of emergent issues in a sample debate attest to an earnest attempt to provide a study of practical value to intercollegiate debaters and coaches.

In an effort to appeal to all readers on the continuum of beginning debater to veteran coach, however, *Modern Debate* develops an unevenness of treatment. The precise explications of strategy, case construction, and the logical processes are hardly compatible with the elementary (and on occasion, questionable) suggestions for promoting teamwork, greeting the opposition, and phrasing the speech, and with the fragmentary analyses of term-definition, the key issue of desirability, and group discussion.

Modern Debate is clear in holding that intercollegiate debate is or should be primarily an exercise in logic and that such "persuasive means" as "constant repetition, suggestion of all kinds . . . and subtle or crude appeals" are "entirely outside the scope, and foreign to the spirit" of the book. Yet, the "persuasive" overtones which color many passages betray this point of view. For example, the text describes a given stratagem as "logically justifiable" but "psychologically weak" (p. 55); it calls attention to a speaker's effective use of the "rhetorical device" of "repetition" (p. 330); it suggests that the final negative speaker "might tactfully remind the judge that . . . the negative is without rejoinder" (p. 104); and it identifies "meaningful facial expressions" as an aid not only to "clarity" but to "persuasion" (p. 278).

Introducing Contest Debate strives "metaphorically" to explain debate to the beginning high school debater. Redundant, imprecise, and erring in its overemphasis on the stratagem of surprise, in advising that "it is almost always better to refrain from answering [an argument] than to do a second rate job," and in devoting five of its forty-seven pages to "persuasive debate jokes," the booklet could well serve as the source of many misconceptions of contest debating.

James W. Cleary
University of Wisconsin

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY AND WENDELL WILLKIE. By Donald Bruce Johnson. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1960; xii+354. $5.50.

Mr. Johnson's primary purpose is to assess Wendell Willkie's contributions to the "New Republicanism." The major portion of the book deals with the important five-year period which climaxed Willkie's life, the period from 1939, when he first obtained a national audience as a critic of the New Deal, to his death from a heart attack on October 8, 1944. The author presents a systematic and detailed analysis of Willkie's activities during these five years. His account of the 1940 Republican Convention and the campaign that followed is one of the best that I have seen. Although he does not concentrate on Willkie's speaking techniques, he does summarize fully the major ideas that were presented in the speeches and the reactions of the voters, and the party leaders, to these ideas. The picture of the campaign strategy which emerges is both clear and interesting. The latter half of the book is concerned with Willkie's role as a leader of the "loyal opposition," with emphasis on the development of his "One World" crusade.

The book is a significant contribution to American political and historical analysis. Above all, it gives the reader an understanding of Willkie, the man—the way in which he worked with the people in his party and his impact upon them and upon Republican policy. After reading it, one can understand why the editors of the *New York Times* wrote in 1944: "Party, country and One World owe this man a debt which the years will not discharge. More than any other single man he fought to lead his party from isolation to cooperation on the stage of world affairs. As much as any other man he helped to shape for debate and action the great issues of the most critical years in the lifetime of the American people. . . ."

Orville Hitchcock
State University of Iowa

BIBLICAL AUTHORITY FOR MODERN PREACHING. By Charles W. F. Smith. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960; pp. 176. $3.50.

This book is presented as a resource work for analyzing the "new situation" which confronts the minister, and for rediscovering the authority of the Bible.

Professor Smith finds four factors in the contemporary setting which contrast with the Biblical world: (1) the methods of group dynamics, (2) the scientific method of investigation, (3) the impact of the American ethos, and (4) the loss of the preacher's audience. He insists, however, that in spite of these differences, by its very nature the Christian faith demands the preaching of the Word. The analysis of the present audience is excellent, and the value of the work is increased by references to additional studies.

Another contribution of the book is the argument for preaching the church calendar Professor Smith insists that the minister is working with a message which has been "given," and in following the church calendar he is presenting the essential doctrines of the "given" rather than his own favorite themes.

As a teacher of New Testament and Homiletics, Professor Smith brings to bear both scholarship and practical experience in this work. The book reflects some of the better theological discussion on the task of making the Biblical message relevant to the twentieth-century audience.

Thomas H. Olbricht
Harvard Divinity School

SHOP TALK

ROBERT L. SCOTT, *Editor*

ON LETTERS RECOMMENDING

As one of ST's colleagues said, "The worst thing about the rising college student population is having to write more letters recommending your graduates." This problem is especially pressing for speech teachers; we not only have our own majors, but who among us has not faced countless students asking that he write recommending them with a plaintive, "I'm not a speech major, but all my other classes are so large that no other professor really knows me." We polish our generalities and put another sheet of paper in the typewriter.

When we receive letters recommending, however, we are exasperated to see our platitudes returning seemingly tenfold. As Jacques Barzun has remarked, "Short of proved criminal tendencies or dementia praecox, every candidate turns out to be able, responsible, co-operative and well trained. The astonishing variety of mankind nowhere appears in these documents; rather, the population of the country turns out to consist wholly of paragons, for letters that hint of a defect are a species of death warrant and hence are seldom written" (*House of Intellect,* pp. 185-86).

Barzun's statement gave ST some second thoughts concerning his plan for forming the Society for Encouraging Frank Letters of Recommendation, so he decided to seek the opinions of a few respected citizens in departments around the country. ST hadn't realized that the subject was so explosive, but he shall respect the wishes of the majority of his informants for anonymity. The range of replies is bracketed by one in the Admiral Farragut attitude on the one hand:

> May I suggest that . . . the SAA Placement Service spell out the conditions to be met by would-be hyperbolic panegyrists if their letters are to be accepted for distribution to hiring agents?
>
> 1. The use of the superlative degree is expressly forbidden.
> 2. Damnation with faint praise will not be accepted as a substitute for a list of shortcomings.
> 3. Letters containing specific information will be given priority over those containing vacuities.
>
> Candidates may not like such truth requirements and might prefer to register elsewhere, but hiring agents within the SAA would regard dossiers of this sort as hiring hall manna and would turn over all others to refuse collectors.

And on the other hand, by one which accepts resignedly the philosophy of the three monkeys:

> Letters of recommendation are simply an exaggerated instance of the problem of talking with other people about qualities for which no common point of reference may exist. Since this is the case, and since most letters of recommendation come from persons who wish success for the subject of the letter, I suspect that we can hope for little relief from the general uselessness of such letters.

If the latter is right, then perhaps we should file with our secretaries a long list of numbered paragraphs so that when a letter is requested we can simply direct that paragraphs 2, 5, 8, 12, and 16 be used with the proper name inserted.

Succor for those seeking information via letters of recommendation, say nearly every one of ST's correspondents, is, to quote one of them, "to get to know the manners and the minds of a vast number of colleagues. Then we can read the authors!" The letter writer will perhaps be interested in his own reputation in the long run. As another informant said, "We have felt compelled to be pretty honest in our own letters of recommendation. We haven't wanted to get the reputation of automatically singing the praises of all our own graduates." And another: "We tend to discount letters of recommendation that come from certain leaders in our field. There are also certain universities whose letters of recommendation we pay less attention to than others."

Several correspondents indicated that those who request letters recommending applicants often get just what they deserve; as one put it, "Actually I suspect that many letters of recommendation are more or less useless because the inquiry did not contain well-phrased questions." If you want specific information, ask for it. Asked or not, one informant testifies that he tries to be as specific as possible:

> Personally, I have tried to write letters which describe as much as possible the behavior of the person I am writing about. When I get over into the realm of assessing ability I try to describe an individual in terms of his standing relative to other graduate students in our department. . . . This makes it possible for me to get one step away from the glittering generalities by making reference to the fact that a given student is in the top 5% of his class or is slightly below the average master's candidate I have known . . . and recognizing that half of our graduate students are below the average . . . I think I am able to write letters of recommendation that are as fair as possible to the student and at the same time help to increase the confidence of people in the letters of recommendation that we write.

ST asked one department chairman whose school uses a blank requesting an estimation relative to other students of the percentage in which the applicant stands, if anyone had ever checked anything below the upper 25%. "I suspect that I never checked anything under the upper 25%. I have never seen a blank that carries a percentage lower than that," he replied. "When the word 'average' is used, I occasionally have had the courage to check it." Well, perhaps requests for specificity have their limits.

Again and again, our correspondents made the point that the problem is perhaps not so serious as ST suggested in his request to them. As one said, "Letters of recommendation don't do much except to help you and your colleagues decide whether you really want to take a close look at the man. Then if you want to pursue the candidate you obviously do so by telephone, interview, and informal conversation, eventually finding someone who will speak with judicious candor." This may quite well be true in employing a teacher for a college department, although even then one may wonder if it is not better to have candid opinions from a number of men who know the candidate and may not be readily available to be coaxed to confidence over a convivial cup; but what of the poor senior student who is competing with his fellows for a position in business or industry, or the applicant for a scholarship to be granted by distant boards of review, or the man looking for a secondary school teaching position?

In addition to general questions, ST asked his correspondents, "How would you (assume yourself the employing agent for a large corporation) regard this paragraph in a letter-recommending:

> Mr. Jones is an altogether pleasant young man. He follows instructions faithfully and is not daunted by heavy assignments to which he will apply high energy and average intelligence. In my experience, he has not the ability to work effectively without specific directions. If the position you have is one that requires energy and faithful adherence to rather specific procedures, Mr. Jones is your man. If you are looking for someone who has imagination, who can create new approaches

to old tasks or find new tasks, Mr. Jones is scarcely your man.

Has Jones been given the "kiss of death"? The statement is one that ST made (or a reasonable facsimile) about a senior student last spring.

Almost every reply said that poor Jones would never get a job. As a matter of fact, however, in a newspaper story indicating how our arts college placement bureau finds jobs for liberally educated young men and women, "Jones" was featured as the young man who had the most job offers of any 1960 graduate. He had his pick among a dozen. Either our academicians had difficulty assuming themselves choosing employees for large business concerns, or some kindly clerk in the placement office removed ST's letter from the file.

ST agrees that "letters of recommendation are a chore, a duty, an obligation; they are things which should be done promptly yet get postponed to the limits of desperate decorum." Perhaps a Society for Encouraging Frank Letters of Recommendation would aid all concerned. ST's kindly old advisor says, "If we'd been completely frank, you might still be unemployed." That may be taken as an argument either pro or con.

CONVENTIONS

ASHA. The American Speech and Hearing Association's 1960 Convention met in Los Angeles at the Statler Hilton Hotel, November 5-8. The members found the city relatively well recovered from the National Democratic Party's summer visit and were themselves in relatively good condition to hurry home to cast ballots on the fifteenth. Although most conventioneers seemed to be enjoying the legendary sights, beauties, and activities of Southern California, in spite of just a touch of smog, the association was able to accomplish some business.

One innovation this year was the meeting of the House of State Delegates. Each state Speech and Hearing Association which is approved for affiliation by ASHA is entitled to send a delegate to sit in the House of State Delegates. This group currently does not have legislative authority, but instead, serves as a more or less grass roots organization to bring information and requests to the attention of the Executive Council, which is the governing board. Approximately twenty states have fulfilled the necessary requirements for affiliation with ASHA, and these states were represented at the first meeting of the House of State Delegates.

Another activity which attracted almost a thousand people for the day prior to the official opening of the convention was the report of the two-year study on public school speech and hearing services sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education. The funds for this research have been given by the U.S. Office of Education, and the actual project has been under the supervision of the Research Committee of ASHA. A full-time paid staff has been carrying out the research and has been housed on the Purdue University campus. Many members of ASHA have participated in the study as gatherers of information, circulators of questionnaires, etc. The end result of the two-year study will probably be a monograph published by ASHA. This study should point the way for a good deal of much needed research in the field of public school speech and hearing services. In many ways it is a companion study to the one we completed a year or so ago under the sponsorship of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, which was concerned with research needs in the field of adult rehabilitation of individuals with communication disorders.

Another rather exciting development at this convention was the report of the American Board of Examiners in Speech Pathology and Audiology. This is a group which was established by ASHA to make some headway with the general problem of increasing standards. The Board has divided itself into a number of sub-boards. One of these is concerned with education and training and is moving to take the necessary steps to accredit centers for training speech pathologists and audiologists. Another board will be concerned with evaluating the adequacy of clinical services provided in the fields of hearing and speech pathology. Still another board will be concerned with setting up the examination procedures for the granting of the Diplomate to individuals of outstanding competence in either speech pathology or audiology.

The rapidly rising standards of our profession are indicated by a recommendation by the Executive Council that effective January, 1963, a master's degree will be required for membership in ASHA. This action will, of course, require the approval of the membership by means of an amendment to the present bylaws. Because this increase in membership requirements represents a rather big step, the Executive Council recommended that the next year be used as a period of discussion relative to this proposed change. The actual amendment to the constitution will not be submitted for membership consideration for another year.

The Executive Council approved and is submitting to the membership for approval a provision to eliminate the present two levels of clinical certification and substitute a single level of certification roughly equivalent to the present advanced certification level. All of this may sound like a lot of technical jargon. What it boils down to is that we have just about reached the point where undergraduate specialization in speech pathology and audiology is a thing of the past. If I see the picture correctly, within the next several years training in speech pathology and audiology will be graduate professional training superimposed on a baccalaureate degree, which I hope will be in liberal arts.

The honors of the association were awarded to Raymond Carhart of Northwestern and to Charles S. Bluemel.

Stanley Ainsworth, University of Georgia, turned over the president's gravel to Paul Moore, Northwestern University, who will preside over the 1961 convention at the Sherman Hotel in Chicago, November 5-8.

JACK MATTHEWS
University of Pittsburgh

WSA. The convention of the Western Speech Association, November 24-26, at Corvallis, Oregon, was warm and friendly with a great deal of precipitation outdoors and indoors. It contained the customary well-balanced diets of nibbles from each of the multifarious areas of speech with three mixed grills at general sessions.

The convention goers celebrated Thanksgiving with a banquet. Robert T. Oliver, Pennsylvania State University, addressed the banquet on "A Rhetorical View of Our Foreign Policy." Earl Wells, Oregon State College, the last surviving founder of our association and our present Custodian of Records, was honored at the banquet with a special tribute delivered by Horace Rahskopf.

Our program would probably sound to other SAAers like that of any regional convention, but you must pardon our feeling that there were a higher than average number of outstanding papers and stimulating meetings. Although our statistics are unimpressive—two hundred plus attended—this year, that was more than made up for by the hospitality of our host school, Oregon State College.

You should relax, ST [ST assumes that our reporter is addressing non-Westerners generally], and join us at our next convention! Fresno State College will be host to WSA, November 23-25. Our officers are Theodore O. H. Karl, Pacific Lutheran University, president; John Wright, Fresno State College, first vice president; Halbert Greaves, University of Utah, second vice president; and Earl Cain, Long Beach State College, executive secretary. [Our reporter did not mention that the retiring president is Lawrence H. Mouat, San Jose State College.]

LAWRENCE H. MOUAT
San Jose State College

SHOP TALK SPEECH CONVENTION CALENDAR

NATIONAL

Speech Association of America: Statler Hilton, New York, December 27-30; (1962, Cleveland; 1963 [August], Denver; 1964, Chicago).

American Educational Theatre Association: University of Denver, August 28-30; (1962, University of Minnesota, August 24-26; 1963, University of Oregon, August 26-28; 1964, University of Pittsburgh, August 27-29).

American Speech and Hearing Association: Sherman, Chicago, November 5-8.

National Society for the Study of Communication: with SAA in New York.

NUEA Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials: with SAA in New York.

REGIONAL

Southern States: Hotel Everglades, Miami, April 6-7 (High School and College Forensic Meet and Student Congress, April 3-7).

Eastern States: Henry Hudson Hotel, New York, April 13-15.

Central States: LaSalle Hotel, Chicago, April 14-15.

Western States: Fresno State College, November 23-25.

Forensics

The sign of a real baseball fan is his taste for statistics and records—the most fly balls caught by outfielders in a six-game world series, for example. On the off-chance that debate fans may have a similar taste, ST offers the following gleanings from his mail. At Pennsylvania State University, 114 women tried out for the intercollegiate debate (Penn State has men's and women's squads), 80 were "retained." At the Columbia Valley Speech Tournament in Pullman, Washington, this fall, schools six thousand miles apart met face-to-face in a debate when the University of Hawaii contested with Bates College of Lewiston, Maine; this is believed to be a United States distance record. The executive secretary of the Oregon High School Speech League, Kirt Montgomery, reports that the fifty-three year old league now embraces 101 schools. The last state tournament, held at the University of Oregon, brought together 208 competitors representing forty-eight schools, all of whom were "survivors" of earlier district tournaments. The University of Hawaii reports an average attendance of 125 students at its Wednesday legislative forum.

ST has learned about one very interesting development in forensic financing. The Baylor Ex-Debaters Association met for a breakfast at homecoming, October 22, and voted to start a campaign for $60,000 to endow the school's forensic program, to be named the "Glenn R. Capp Endowed Forensic Society" in honor of Mr. Capp who last year completed his twenty-sixth year as Baylor's forensic director.

A former coach of debate at Colgate University, Lawrence A. Appley, has contributed $500.00 toward the expense of conducting a special debate tournament in honor of Carl Kallgren. Mr. Kallgren was also a former coach of debate at Colgate and is currently the Dean of the University. The tournament will be inaugurated this spring with plans to invite former Colgate debaters to return to campus to serve as "unbiased" judges. Details may be obtained from Robert G. Smith, Colgate's *present* debate coach.

More debate activity is being televised and, in Texas at least, is finding sponsors. Fourteen Texas schools are participating in a series of television debates: The University of Texas, Texas A & M, Texas Technological College, Baylor University, Rice University, Southern Methodist University, Texas Christian University, North Texas State College, Lamar Technological College, Stephen F. Austin State College, Southwest Texas State College, Abilene Christian College, Hardin-Simmons College, and the University of Houston. All schools will receive funds from Sinclair Oil and Refining Company, the sponsoring organization, to be used for scholarships.

WBBM-TV began "Rebuttal" this fall—"the first televised high school invitational debate tournament." Thirty-two high schools from Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin participated in the series of sixteen half-hour debates. An indoctrination clinic for participating schools was held at Northwestern University. Northwestern is cooperating with WBBM in presenting the programs, and Frank Nelson has been in charge of preparing the format for the debates.

Too many schools to mention have reported holding clinics or workshops on their campuses for high school debaters. This service activity is apparently expanding greatly.

INTERNATIONAL DEBATE. Two representatives of the Oxford Union Society ended a three-month American tour at the University of Illinois, December 12. There they were greeted by A. Craig Baird, visiting professor of speech, who started international debating in 1921 when he visited Oxford with representatives of Bates College. The Oxford men on the 1960 tour were Anthony Newton and Alan Jupp. They began their tour in Indiana, went to Canada and the Pacific coast, and then back through the Southwest, and ended in Illinois. It was the seventh Oxford tour of America since World War II.

This spring two debaters from New Zealand will tour eastern colleges. For further information write to David Wodlinger, Director, European Department, Institute of International Education, 1 East 67th Street, New York 21.

Oral Interpretation

Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, announces that a grant by Webcor, Inc., has made possible a taped intercollegiate contest in oral interpretation with a first prize of $500. All contestants must read Edna St. Vincent Millay's "Renascence." Deadline for entries is March 1, 1961. Information may be requested from Lou Sirois, Speech Department.

The Adelphi College Readers' Theatre has scheduled a faculty reading of Mark Twain's "The Loves of Alonzo Fitzclarence and Roshannah Ethelton."

Participants from sixteen colleges and universities attended the annual Baylor University Poetry Festival in November. Chloe Armstrong is the originator and director of the festival.

A program at DePaul University in November featured Albert T. Martin's reading from *The Screwtape Letters.*

Northwestern University has scheduled Readers Theatre productions of *Samson Agonistes, Breakfast at Tiffany's,* and *The Bacchae.* In addition to these productions, the department sponsors monthly public reading hours. Members of the faculty have read from works by D. H. Lawrence, T. S. Eliot, W. H. Auden, and Thomas Hardy. In December, Gertrude Brown and Lila Letchinger presented, in chamber theatre style, short stories by James Thurber, Dorothy Parker, Edith Wharton, and Katherine Mansfield.

The Queens College Readers Workshop under the direction of Dorothy Rambo has scheduled a series of six reading hours this year.

The Readers Theatre at the University of Arizona has scheduled productions of *Mourning Becomes Electra,* Part I; selections from *The Canterbury Tales*; and selections from *I Knock at the Door.* Alethea Smith Mattingly is in charge of the programs.

The University of California, Santa Barbara, presented a Readers Theatre production of *The Devil and Daniel Webster* in November. The production was also presented at San Marcos High School as the first of a series of programs for high school students in the Santa Barbara area. A production of *The Loved One* is planned for spring.

Students at the University of Georgia presented a reading of *The Trojan Women* for high school students attending a workshop in November.

The University of Hawaii is presenting its twelfth year of public reading hours with plans for twelve programs. For the past two years, our informant says, no audience has been under two hundred. Last year there was SRO in an auditorium seating five hundred for performances of *The Barretts of Wimpole Street* and *The Love of Four Colonels.* The programs, started by Joseph F. Smith, are now under the direction of Lorinda Watson.

The Readers Theatre at the University of Missouri produced *Antigone* as a part of the university's arts and science week in November. Reading hours during the fall semester have featured John G. Neihardt, poet and lecturer in English at the University. Joseph F. Smith, University of Hawaii, presented a reading recital, "The Miracle of Language," as part of the University Assembly Series.

At West Virginia University two reading hours were presented this fall: "The Balladeer" program devoted to the area of folk literature known as the work song, and "A Holiday Reading Hour," drawing from literature appropriate to the celebration of Hannukah and Christmas. A reading performance of *Caesar and Cleopatra* is scheduled.

Radio, Television, and Film

The University of Akron's closed circuit television operation, under the supervision of Ray H. Sandefur, began February 1. Televised courses include two speech classes for two hours per week, an education course for two hours, a mathematics course for three hours, and a beginning science course for four hours.

WMUU, Bob Jones University, has recently installed an Ampex tape-duplicating system capable of making five copies of a half-hour recording in less than four minutes.

The television production workshop of Bowling Green State University presented two one-act plays over closed circuit in November. The plays were written, directed, and acted by students.

The first of a monthly series of television productions entitled "On Campus" at Lamar State College (Texas) was devoted to educational theatre. Judson D. Ellertson directed and participated in the program. George E. Bogusch and W. Patrick Harrigan, III, and students from the cast of the college's production of *Romeo and Juliet* appeared with Mr. Ellertson.

Pacific Lutheran University this fall began operation of a closed circuit television system with seven sources of pictures distributed about the campus, two new studios, and control rooms housed in the new administration-classroom building.

The Grand Prix and Silver Medal of the Netherlands International Student Film Festival was awarded to a University of California at Los Angeles student-produced film, "Time Out of War." The award recognizes the film, directed by Denis Sanders for an M.A. degree at UCLA in 1955 and photographed by his brother, Terry, "as the best student-produced film made anywhere in the world during the past ten years."

Faculty and advanced students at the University of Michigan assisted in demonstrations of closed circuit TV for those attending a conference on the use of TV in teaching sponsored by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education on the Michigan campus in January. Michigan also announces that Edward Stasheff has been appointed administrator of the instructional TV project which includes the university cooperation with the Midwest Program on Airborne Television Instruction. This appointment includes giving advice and assistance to local school systems which will be installing equipment in preparation for receiving airborne programs beginning this month.

William S. Howell, University of Minnesota, began in December a series of twelve half-hour television programs dealing with the nature and use of persuasion in our society. The series, video-taped under the sponsorship of the Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Company, uses graduate students in a seminar-type format.

KOAC-TV of the Oregon System of Higher Education produced two special programs in December—a Christmas special on tape under the supervision of John Shepherd, Arthur Jacob, Howard Ramey, and David Lewis of the University of Oregon and a television adaptation of the University Theater's *The Cherry Orchard* which was presented live.

WFDD, Wake Forest College, began operation of FM broadcasts in January. In the past, the station had been restricted to campus broadcasts. Programming is under the direction of Julian C. Burroughs.

Enid Portnoy, West Virginia University, appeared on Pittsburgh's Educational Television Channel 13 in November to open the university's cultural series utilizing faculty and student talent. Mrs. Portnoy's program, entitled "Stranger than a Dream," was a half-hour presentation of the writings of Robert Frost, Thomas Wolfe, Robert Benchley, and James Thurber.

PROGRAMS FOR BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY

Iowa State University offered a two-day institute in communication in December for middle and senior level executives from Iowa industries. The sessions in speaking and listening were conducted by Harry A. Ausprich, Ralph L. Towne, and William R. Underhill. James McBurney, Northwestern University, made the featured address—"The Price of Silence."

Jack Brilhard, Pennsylvania State University, has conducted communication programs this fall for the United Steelworkers of America and the Communication Workers of America. H. William Symington has conducted special programs in discussion leadership for the Pennsylvania State University's Center for Continuing Liberal Education in Newport, Elizabethville, and Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Herbert Simons and Robert Olian, Temple University, are teaching basic courses in industrial communications for the Philadelphia Electric Company. Mr. Simons is also teaching a special course for supervisors.

Elizabeth Carr, John P. Hosher, and Joseph F. Smith, University of Hawaii, have been working to establish a new chapter for the Study of General Semantics among Honolulu business and industry executives.

Frank E. X. Dance, William A. Conboy, Kim Giffin, and E. C. Buehler, University of Kansas, served as the faculty for the Midwest Management Institute, sponsored by the Associated Credit Bureaus of America. Frank Dance and William Conboy also acted as lecturers for the Kansas Peace Officer's Institute.

The Michigan speech department held the Ninth Annual Conference on Speech Communication in Business and Industry in November. The theme, "Improving Personal Communication Skills," was developed by presenting communication theory in lectures and then working in small groups. Speakers for the meeting were drawn from English, audio-visual education, Bureau of Industrial Relations, Survey Research Center, and speech. Luncheon speaker was William Sattler—"Fact and Fantasy in Communication."

THEATRE SCHEDULES

Adelphi College: *The Great God Brown; The Boy with a Cart; Come Back, Little Sheba; Comedy of Errors.*

Carnegie Institute of Technology: *Boy Meets Girl, Twelfth Night, The Lower Depths, The Marriage of Figaro, The Chalk Garden.*

Drake University: *Time of the Cuckoo, Tomorrow and Tomorrow, John Brown's Body* (Charles Laughton's adaptation of Stephen Vincent Benet's poem), *The Rope Dancers, High Tor.*

Fresno State College: *Right You Are!, A Clearing in the Woods, Dark of the Moon.*

Illinois State Normal University: *Antigone, The Red Shoes* (children's play), and an evening of one-acts.

Immaculata Junior College (Washington, D. C.): *The Real Princess, The Fisherman and His Wife, The Emperor's New Clothes* (all children's plays).

Iowa Wesleyan: *Waiting for Godot, The Visit, King Lear.*

Kansas State University: *Kiss Me Kate, Come Back, Little Sheba, On Borrowed Time, Streets of New York, Ladies in Retirement.*

Lamar State College: *Blithe Spirit, Romeo and Juliet.*

Louisiana State University: *Look Homeward, Angel, The Rainmaker, Look Back in Anger,* and two short operas—*The Game of Chance, The Meeting.*

Miami University: *Julius Caesar.*

Oberlin College: *The Madwoman of Chaillot, Macbeth, Romanoff and Juliet, Iolanthe, Utopia Limited, La Guerre de Troi N'aura pas Lieu.*

St. Louis University: *The Little Foxes, Angel Street, All Gaul Is Divided, Othello, The Playboy of the Western World, The Importance of Being Earnest.*

Southern Methodist University: *The Fan, Summer and Smoke, The Skin of Our Teeth, Arms and the Man,* and an evening of original one-acts.

Southwest Texas State College: *The Skin of Our Teeth, Time Remembered.*

Temple University: *Summertime, Uncle Vanya, The Killer.*

Texas College of Arts and Industries: *The Diary of Anne Frank, Many Moons* (children's play).

University of Akron: *The Dark at the Top of the Stairs, Billy Budd, Born Yesterday, The Mikado,* and an evening of one-acts.

University of Delaware: *J. B., At the Drop of a Hat, Period of Adjustment* ("world premiere of Tennessee Williams' first attempt at comedy.")

University of Georgia: *The Country Girl, The Trojan Women, Arms and the Man.*

University of Houston: *The Diary of Anne Frank, Bus Stop, Orpheus Descending, The Devil's Disciple.*

University of Michigan: *The Firstborn, The Frogs, Pelleas and Melisande, School for Husbands, The Visit,* and portions of three operas —*I Pagliacci, Hansel and Gretel, The Flying Dutchman.*

University of Minnesota: *Radio Rescue* (children's play) and two new plays—*In the Cage, Tell Me No Lies.*

University of Oregon: *Annie Get Your Gun, The Potting Shed.*

University of Pittsburgh: *Toad of Toad Hall* (children's play).

University of Portland: *The Playboy of the Western World, The Great God Brown, Pygmalion.*

University of South Florida: *Antigone* and two one-acts—*Pullman Car Hiawatha, The Brick and The Rose.*

University of Texas: *The Visit, The Beaux Strategem, Candide, Howie,* and a Shakespearean production to be announced.

Wake Forest College: *The Visit, Kismet.*

West Virginia University: *Charley's Aunt, Brigadoon, Tiger at the Gates, The Stronger, Medea,* and two childen's plays—*The Shoemaker's Wife, The Story of Androcles.*

Woman's College of the University of North Carolina: *Ring Around the Moon.*

THEATRE NOTES

Alpha Psi Omega at Iowa Wesleyan college has formed a traveling troupe to take plays to other colleges and to schools, churches, and civic organizations. Plays in their repertoire are *No Exit, The Shewing up of Blanco Posnet, Everyman,* and *Waiting for Godot.*

The Speech-Theater Department of Long Island University conducted a symposium in December on "Contemporary Theater" with playwright Elmer Rice, actress Blanche Yurka, director Alan Schneider, and producer Paul Libin.

For the second year, the State University Teachers College, Geneseo, New York, is sponsoring a road show which will tour a dozen high schools in southern and western New York. Two casts will alternate in presenting Eugene O'Neill's one-act play, *Ile.*

The St. Louis University Theatre has added two additional evenings to the run of each regular production. On opening night all faculty members are invited to attend as guests of the theatre; on the following night all staff and personnel of the university are invited. In spite of the "complimentary" theatre-goers, box office sales have increased by one-third.

John Houseman, producer and director of theatre, motion picture, and television drama, has been named a Regents Lecturer in theater arts at the University of California at Los Angeles for a two-month period. He will lecture to classes, meet with seminars of selected students, and give a public lecture. Houseman was co-founder with Orson Welles of the Mercury Theater, artistic director of the American Shakespeare Festival in Stratford, Connecticut, and a director of the depression era's Federal Theater Project.

Over 1,300 Michigan high school teachers and students attended the University of Michigan's annual High School Drama Day in November. The program included the presentation of Aristophanes' *The Frogs,* performed in the varsity swimming pool.

The University Theater at the University of Oregon will employ a full-time shop foreman beginning next fall. Although the position is not yet filled, it has received university sanction and funds. "This is perhaps particularly noteworthy," writes our Oregon informant, "because it represents what many educational theatres have been attempting to achieve for so long, i.e., convincing the administration of the impossible situation many technical directors face in attempting to design and build year-round in addition to regular teaching duties."

The Curtis Theater Collection has just been presented to the University of Pittsburgh Library by Ford E. Curtis, professor of English, and Mrs. Curtis. Volumes of plays, reviews, journals, histories, pictures, and other memorabilia comprise the collection. Its special strength will be a complete documentation and history for each contemporary play included.

A full-length play contest conducted by the Western Players of the Western Washington College is now in progress. A prize of $100 and production in the 1961 Summer Fine Arts Festival will be awarded the author of the play selected. The winning author will be invited to attend the festival. Entries are restricted to plays not yet produced or commercially published. The contest closes March 15, 1961. Further information may be obtained from Harry E. Stiver, Jr., Director of Theatre, Western Washington College, Bellingham, Washington.

Two rather extensive brochures, "Lighting Systems for Children's Theatres" and "Engineered Lighting and Control Equipment for Open Stage Theatres," are available upon request from the Hub Electric Company, 2255 West Grand Avenue, Chicago 12, Illinois.

NOTES FROM THE CLINICS

The Baylor University Speech Clinic, under the direction of Thomas B. Abbott, has moved to new first floor quarters that include eight clinic rooms, a classroom, and an office. Thirty students are now majoring in speech and hearing therapy.

With the addition to the Indiana University staff of Earl D. Schubert, former director of graduate research at the Cleveland Hearing and Speech Center of Western Reserve University, an expanded series of courses is planned in the areas of experimental phonetics and experimental audiology.

Kansas State University has established a working arrangement with the Kansas Neurological Institute at Topeka to enable advanced therapy students to earn three semester hours of clinical practice with children at the Institute.

The Speech Clinic of St. Louis University is carrying out a series of one-day workshops for correctionists in the St. Louis area. J. Keith Graham, Northwestern University, and Jon Eisenson, Queens College, will visit for one program.

The Dallas Speech and Hearing Center will present its annual Hearing Seminar in March on the Southern Methodist University Campus. As part of the program, Peggy Harrison, S.M.U., will speak on "How Universities Work with Speech and Hearing Centers."

The State University Teacher's College, Geneseo, New York, is now offering programs leading to New York State Certification in speech and hearing correction, and in speech education.

During the past few months, Texas Technological College has acquired an acoustically treated room equipped with new audiometers which enable the clinic to provide hearing evaluation and hearing aid selection service.

The Speech and Hearing Clinic at the University of Arizona has instituted a "Lost Cord Club" for laryngectomized patients and a program for adult aphasics.

Under a grant from the Georgia Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, a short course for the rehabilitation of persons with speech and hearing problems was offered by the University of Georgia for vocational rehabilitation counselors in December. The course will be repeated in June.

Lennart L. Kopra, University of Texas, is working on an Air Force Contract on a project to study the hearing damage risk of Air Force ground crew personnel. Present work involves quantification and analysis of noise exposure of B-52 and KC-135 aircraft.

CURRICULA

Colgate University has added laboratory facilities for speech instruction. The laboratory includes two individual, sound-proofed booths for listening and recording; a control room; and thirty sound-conditioned listening-recording positions in the main room. Five classrooms are wired for sound. It is now possible to schedule six separate programs simultaneously. Thus far the laboratory has been used only in supplementing regular classroom work, but special programs are being designed that will make the facilities useful for all students and, ultimately, for research purposes. Robert G. Smith solicits ideas for materials to be used in building a listening library.

Lock Haven State College now requires that all English majors take oral interpretation and play production.

Two courses are being added to the undergraduate speech curriculum at Long Island University—history of the theatre and audiology.

During the second semester Louisiana State University will offer its first course in television production. The course, under John Pennybacker, will be taught in new studios.

Pacific Lutheran University is expanding its telecommunications program in order to give a full major in the field within two years. Plans are to change the department's name to Oral Communications and to affiliate with the School of Fine and Applied Arts. The department will then offer a Bachelor of Fine Arts in Drama.

Ripon College is now using a paper and pencil test of speech proficiency. Results are being used to place students into sections of fundamentals and of beginning public speaking.

To meet rising enrollments, Temple University has enlarged sections in public speaking and in voice and articulation courses to fifty students. The instructor lectures but divides the group for performance assignments with graduate assistants.

The University of Portland has introduced a program in playwriting. Reading performances of student-written plays are being given under the direction of Paul E. Ouelette.

Radio and television courses at the University of Texas are now a part of the speech department curriculum. In making this change, eleven staff members have been transferred to the department from the School of Journalism.

Eba G. Currie, Martin Todaro, Mac Moseley, and Ora T. Bennett are teaching a special course for foreign students at the University of Texas. The course is financed by the Saudi Arabian Government through an arrangement with the university under which fifty-nine Saudi Arabian high school graduates will receive English training and review of basic subjects before undertaking advanced study.

Three new courses have been added to the speech curriculum at Wake Forest College—radio and television production, history of the theatre, and theories of acting.

GRANTS

Morton Gordon of the University of Hawaii has received a $19,388 Title VII grant from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. This grant permits Mr. Gordon to continue his experimentation in the uses of television instruction in teaching elementary speech improvement. The project, which began in January, 1960, should be completed in February, 1962. The study involves approximately 600 children in nineteen Hawaiian public schools.

Raymond G. Smith, department of speech and theatre, Sydney Drouse, department of radio and television, and Richard Yokum, department of journalism, all of Indiana University, received a grant from the Graduate Research Fund to aid in a survey of attitude changes resulting from the first and fourth Kennedy-Nixon debates.

Pacific Lutheran University announces that a Ford Foundation grant has made it possible to allow three professors to teach full time on closed circuit TV this year. One of these is Theodore O. H. Karl, who is teaching fundamentals of speech; he is also in charge of the television programming of course work.

University of Missouri Instructional Television, under the direction of Barton Griffith, is recording eleven regular university courses, including public speaking, on tape. This is a three-year program under a partial grant of $90,000 from the Ford Foundation. Loren Reid will conduct the public speaking course. Professors are released from all other teaching assignments to plan and prepare during the summer, to present the course live in the fall and spring semesters, and to record during the spring semester.

The Speech and Hearing Clinic of West Virginia University has received a federal grant for the study of the hearing of retarded children.

BUILDINGS

The Division of Speech Arts, Fresno State College, took possession of its new building at the beginning of fall semester. The two and a half million dollar structure includes a 450 seat proscenium theatre, a 200 seat arena theatre, a complete clinic for speech and hearing therapy, radio and television studios, and facilities for forensics and general speech instruction.

A new Fine Arts Building will be completed for occupancy at Grinnell College in September.

A contract for a $2,600,000 theatre arts building at the University of California at Los Angeles was let in September. The three-story building will include a 600 seat and a 200 seat auditorium, dressing rooms, a large area for building sets, sound and control rooms which will double as classrooms and rehearsal halls, and offices bordering on an open court. Completion date is set for early 1962.

Work is now beginning at the University of Texas on an $800,000 second phase of a theatre plant to replace the one destroyed by fire in 1959. The air-conditioned building will feature a 60' x 60' experimental theatre with floor and ceiling in ten-foot square segments which can be raised or lowered by electronically controlled winches. Plans also include a scene shop, a costume shop with laundry and fitting rooms, individual rehearsal rooms, an outdoor rehearsal terrace, classrooms, dance studios, offices, seminar rooms, and a full basement for storage. The first unit, a 244 seat laboratory theatre was completed in 1959. The third unit, a 1000 seat theatre, will complete the Theatre Center.

APPOINTMENTS

Baylor University: Douglas Thompson.

Boston College: Joseph M. Larkin, S.J., and John Henry Lawton.

Carnegie Tech: Carlo Mazzone and Dan Snyder, assistant professors; Kathleen Stafford and Hal J. Todd, visiting lecturers.

College of Medical Evangelists, Loma Linda, California: Kenneth R. Lutz, director of the speech clinic.

Fresno State College: Lee Alden, Richard Ek, and Lewis Shupe, assistant professors.

General Motors Institute: Cecil Stackpole.

Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute: Jane E. Grills, Thomas L. Headley, William E. Munns, and Jacquelyn M. Steeg.

Indiana University: Earl D. Schubert, professor, and Hazel Scott, lecturer.

Kansas State University: Jim Bob Stephenson, associate professor; Terry Weldon, assistant professor.

Lamar State College of Technology: W. Patrick Harrigan, III, technical director of theatre.

Linfield College: Judith Hawley Bauer.

Pacific Lutheran University: Stanley B. Elberson and Paul Steen, assistant professors; David Christian, chief engineer for radio-television.

Pennsylvania State University: David F. Reifsnyder and Mary Ellen Savage, instructors.

Queens College: Marie Fontana and John P. Workman, lecturers.

Ripon College: Dean F. Graunke, assistant professor.

St. John's University: at Brooklyn—Herbert R. Gillis, associate professor, and Primo Amato and James Hall, instructors; at Jamaica—Audrey O'Brien, associate professor, and Thomas Houchin and Howard Lord, assistant professors.

Temple University: Herbert Simons, assistant professor; Robert Olian and Donald S. Sundquist, instructors.

University of California, Santa Barbara: Gary N. Hess, assistant professor.

University of Hawaii: Bill Turner, assistant professor; Joseph Aurbach, Paula Hayne, James McCroskey, and Harry Zavos, instructors.

University of Houston: Jerry L. Gray.

University of Missouri: William E. Mackie and Donald W. MacLennan.

University of Oregon: Carolyn Silverthorne.

University of South Florida: John W. Caldwell, Alma Johnson Sarett, and Anthony W. Zaitz, associate professors; George E. Beauchamp, visiting associate professor; Harris Pomerantz, assistant professor.

University of Texas: Paul Reinhardt, assistant professor; Rex Weir, director of forensics; Joe A. Bailey and Beverly G. Martin, instructors.

West Virginia University: Maurice Klein and Charles D. Neel, instructors.

PROMOTIONS

Brooklyn College: Paul Brownstone, assistant professor with tenure.

Carnegie Tech: Lawrence Carra and Edith Warman Skinner, professors; Allen Fletcher, associate professor.

Fresno State College: Gaylord O. Graham and Janet Loring, assistant professors.

Indiana University: William E. Kinzer, associate professor; Eugene K. Bristow, assistant professor.

Iowa Wesleyan College: Bob D. Fronterhouse, chairman.

Kansas State College: Forest Whan, director of the summer school; Norma D. Bunton, chairman.

Lock Haven State College: Irving Deer, associate professor.

St. John's University (Jamaica, New York): J. Lyle Joyce and Thomas F. Mader, assistant professors.

University of Michigan: Jack E. Bender and L. LaMont Okey, associate professors.

West Virginia University: Sam Boyd, Jr., professor; Robert B. Burrows, associate professor; Ned Jay Christensen and Joe E. Ford, assistant professors.

ON LEAVE

Grinnell College: William Vanderpool is on leave the second semester; Richard Meyer will serve as chairman in his absence.

Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute: Joe T. Duncan is on leave to work on a doctorate at the University of Michigan.

Indiana University: Edwin J. Culbertson is spending a sabbatical year taking advanced work in phonetics at the University of Edinburgh. William E. Kinzer was on sabbatical for the fall semester doing research on applications of the semantic differential.

Kansas State University: John Robson is on leave teaching in Europe for the Overseas Division of the University of Maryland. Bob Snyder is on leave continuing his graduate study at the University of Iowa.

Pennsylvania State University: Bruce M. Siegenthalter will be on leave the spring semester for professional writing and the development of a seminar course in audiology.

St. John's University (Jamaica, New York): Harold J. O'Brien is on leave to complete doctoral studies at the University of Dublin.

University of Hawaii: Merle Ansberry will be on sabbatical leave during the spring semester. He will travel lecturing at universities and hospitals.

University of Portland: Alvin Keller is on leave working on a doctorate at Stanford University.

University of Texas: Mildred Howard begins an eighteen month leave of absence this month to teach at the American University, Cairo, Egypt. She will be replaced during her absence by Frances Goodhue Loder.

CHARLES F. LINDSLEY, 1894-1960

On October 30, 1960, Charles F. Lindsley, Professor Emeritus, Occidental College, died suddenly at his home, from a heart attack. Professor Lindsley was born in Higginsport, Ohio, on June 8, 1894. He received an A.B. at Ohio State University in 1915, and an A.M. in 1916, and a Ph.D. at the University of Southern California in 1932. He taught at Ohio State, 1916-1917, and at the University of Minnesota from 1918 to 1923, when he went to Occidental.

Professor Lindsley was one of the early leaders in speech education and helped establish this discipline in the colleges and universities of America. He was a scholar and a brilliant teacher who had an unusual skill in oral interpretation. He established the Department of Speech at Occidental College in 1924 and served as its chairman until 1955, when he was made Dean of the Faculty.

Even after his retirement he remained active in educational work. In 1959, he served as director of the Turkish and American governments cooperative program for the widespread introduction of the English language in Turkey.

During his long career, Professor Lindsley participated extensively in professional radio and theatre activities. He wrote and produced several network radio programs during the 1930's and was Director of Radio at the Pasadena Playhouse School of the Theatre from 1934 to 1954.

In 1941 his colleagues in the Western Speech Association recognized his leadership by electing him president of the association.

NORMAN W. FREESTONE
Occidental College

PERSONALS

Richard Albitz resigned in September from the radio-television department at the University of Houston to become station manager of KHUL-FM in Houston.

The University of Texas annual Fine Arts Festival was dedicated this year to Lucy Barton, professor of drama. Miss Barton will retire in June.

Eleanor Bilsborrow, University of Hawaii, traveled and studied in Norway and Denmark during the fall semester.

John F. Borriello, Temple University, has been appointed to the Advisory Committee of the Philadelphia Association for Retarded Children.

"The Big Show versus a Solemn Referendum" was the title of the lecture given by Waldo W. Braden, Louisiana State University, for the Graduate Research Club at Indiana University in November. Mr. Braden spoke to the Oklahoma Speech Association in September on "The Place of Speech in the Curriculum."

Irving Branman, The City College of New

York, is spending a second year on a Fulbright teaching speech and English at the Women's Branch at Robert College, Istanbul.

Glenn R. Capp, Baylor University, gave a series of ten lectures at the Brooke Army Medical School Hospital Administration course in October entitled, "Problem Solving Through Conference." The conference was held at Fort Sam Houston, Texas.

Robert P. Crawford, Queens College, gave two lectures in November to the Four College Teachers Conference at Brooklyn College on "The Implications of TV for Education." Mr. Crawford spoke at Mitchell Air Force Base in October on "The Implications of Television for Air Force Instruction."

Murray M. Halfond, Temple University, is participating in a study of the speech mechanisms at St. Christopher's Hospital for Children under a grant from the National Institutes of Health.

The Southern California Conference of the AAUP recently elected Kenneth Harwood, University of Southern California, president of the conference.

James H. Henning, West Virginia University, has visited new speech department buildings gathering data in order to advise the president of the university on the construction of an Oral Communication Arts Center at West Virginia.

Three professors are back from leave at Indiana University: Richard A. Moody, after a year in England on a Guggenheim Fellowship to study American plays and actors on the British stage; Richard L. Scammon, after a sabbatical semester studying costuming practices in legitimate and educational theatres; and Vincent H. Knauf, after a sabbatical semester for audiological research at the University of Wisconsin.

Owen Peterson, Louisiana State University, has returned from a sabbatical leave; he worked at the British Museum during the first semester of this year.

Ralph S. Pomeroy, University of California, Davis, broadcast his lecture, "Aristotle and Cicero: Two Doctrines of Persuasive Style," over KPFA-FM. The lecture was originally presented as one of the Davis campus's new series, "Lectures in the Humanities."

William R. Reardon, University of Iowa, who is serving as visiting professor at Louisiana State University this year in the absence of Claude L. Shaver, published his first novel, *The Big Smear* (Crown), on October 25.

Horace Robinson, University of Oregon, spoke in January at the regional meeting of school administrators in San Francisco on the subject "Coordinating the Building and Curriculum Program of Public Schools."

Karl Robinson, Northwestern University, was the speaker for a teachers of speech workshop sponsored by Hardin-Simmons University in December. He presented two lectures: "Speech in our Present World" and "The Basic Speech Course."

Stanley Rutherford has returned to the State University Teachers College, Geneseo, New York, after a year teaching in Munich, Germany, for the overseas program of the University of Maryland. Mr. Rutherford made several broadcasts to Africa for the Voice of America while he was in Europe.

Geraldine Brain Siks, University of Washington, lectured at the University of Pittsburgh on "The Place of the Child Drama in the College Curriculum" in November.

Joseph F. Smith has returned to the University of Hawaii after a year teaching at the City College of New York. He taught during the summer at Banff School of Fine Arts.

Robert Sonkin, City College of New York, read a paper at the First International Congress of Phoneticians, held under the auspices of the Phonetics Society of Japan, in Tokyo, August 4-9.

Donald Streeter, Thomas Battin, and Frederick Smith, University of Houston, performed in minor roles in a technicolor motion picture, "The Tomboy and the Champ." The picture, much of which was filmed at the Houston Fat Stock Show, was premiered in Houston in January.

Wesley Wiksell, Louisiana State University, presented a paper on "The Engineering Teacher Speaks" at a symposium on engineering sponsored by the Ford Foundation and held at the Pennsylvania State University in August. During the fall Mr. Wiksell spoke at the University of Missouri and for the Office Management Association of Chicago.

NEW NAMES, SCHOOLS, DEPARTMENTS, ETC. Pacific Lutheran College may now be officially addressed as Pacific Lutheran University. But the University of South Florida declares it is the nation's newest university. USF opened the doors of its three completed buildings to 1,500 freshmen on September 27. "Organized on the principle of the integration of disciplines," our reporter says, "the University of South Florida has no departments. Theatre is a part of the Division of Fine Arts; other phases of speech are included in the Language-Literature Division; both divisions are units of the College of Liberal Arts." Speaking and listening are included in the freshman English course, but a full curriculum for speech is being planned.

In a complex move and change, Potomac University, Washington, D.C., is now Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan. Charles E. Wenigner has been named Vice President for Graduate Affairs and Dean of the School of Graduate Studies; he will also serve as chairman of the speech department.

The speech and drama division of Wake Forest College has been granted departmental status and is now the department of speech, with Franklin R. Shirley as department head.

NOTED. Lionel Crocker, Denison University, writes: "I have just been going over Oscar Sherwin's *Prophet of Liberty: The Life and Times of Wendell Phillips* (New York, 1958), and I note with pleasure how many of our scholars in speech have been referred to. . . . In the acknowledgments there is reference to Bower Aly and W. Hayes Yaeger. In the bibliography there is a listing of Dallas Dickey's study of S. S. Prentiss and John Sattler's study of Wendell Phillips. There may be others, but I caught these."

A QUESTION OF PROPRIETY. A graduate student recently called ST's attention to the form used by the SAA placement bureau. Among the standard requests for his address, weight, degrees, etc., there were several to which he objected, viz., race, nationality, church membership, and church preference. The student, a white protestant (both in preference and membership) with Norwegian forbears, agrees that a specific school or college may well have to find out, or believe that it must know, that its applicants are of certain pigmentation and convictions, but he wonders if the Speech Association of America ought be a party to obtaining such information. ST wonders too.

CAMPAIGN. ST passes along this note: "The staff of the University of Oregon has written the Princeton University Press to urge the re-publication of Wilbur Samuel Howell's *Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500-1700*. If there are others around the country who feel that this volume should be made available to students and schools, we invite them to join the campaign by sending letters to the publisher."

CONVENTION SUPPLEMENT

The latest available report indicates that 1,226 members registered at the forty-fifth annual SAA Convention in St. Louis, December 28-30. The number is approximately 400 fewer than attended the 1959 convention in Washington. ST speculates that the drop in attendance is due principally to those who were repelled by the ebullient close of too many letters, "Meet me in St. Louie," and who decided that old friends are best avoided—for one year at least.

Those of us who attended are now busy spreading the good word among our approximately 5,500 colleagues who did not. St. Louis proved to be a fine convention city, with its share of extracurricular diversions for conventioneers wearied by attending countless meetings or discouraged by trying to decide which among the myriad interest group and sectional meetings to attend. The longest and probably the best attended interest group meeting was that of our radio-television friends held at the Anheuser-Busch Hospitality Room.

The Sheraton-Jefferson Hotel proved to be a mixed blessing. Either the conventioneers were inordinately eager to hear one another read and speak or several of the meeting rooms were too small. On the positive side, however, was the fact that, unlike the Washington meeting, rooms were available at moderate cost and reservations were reservations.

The "debut" idea for sectional meetings seems to be spreading. The Discussion and Group Methods Interest Group presented four papers by young scholars who had not previously appeared on a national convention program or had not had papers published by SAA sponsored journals. The Rhetoric and Public Address Interest Group presented its second "debut" program; this year the program honored W. Norwood Brigance.

Andrew T. Weaver, University of Wisconsin, addressed the convention luncheon, the only meeting of the entire association except for the business meeting on the last day. His address, "Toward Understanding through Speech," was well received. "Friends and Students" of Professor Weaver presented a group of papers in his honor at a section meeting.

The business meeting was a vestige of SAA of the past when business really was conducted at an open meeting. Now our large organization enjoys a representative democratic structure which brings scores of our fellow members to the convention a day early to attend committee meetings and meetings of the Adminis-